

MODERN PHILOLOGY

VOLUME XXXIV

February 1937

NUMBER 3

BERTRAN DE BORN'S SIRVENTES AGAINST KING ALPHONSO OF ARAGON

L. E. KASTNER

MY OBJECT in the present article is to examine, more fully than has been done hitherto, the allegations and allusions contained in the two sirventes of Bertran de Born directed against Alphonso II, king of Aragon (1162-96) and count of Barcelona; and at the same time to discuss certain passages in the text which appear to me to require correction or further elucidation.

Before coming to details and reviewing the two sirventes separately, it seems necessary to set forth briefly the circumstances which account for the mutual enmity existing between the troubadour and the king, and which prompted Bertran de Born to single out Alphonso as the butt for his bitterest vituperation.

As we may gather from Bertran de Born's own words,¹ the immediate cause of his two lampoons against Alphonso was the assistance that monarch had rendered to Richard the Lion-hearted, count of Poitiers and duke of Aquitaine, in the capture of Autafort, Bertran's castle, which Bertran was compelled to surrender on July 6,

¹ Cf. in the first sirvente (strophe 1):

"Sai venc lo reis, don es aunitz,
E sei soudadier logaditz";

and in the second sirvente (strophe 2):

"Mas trop fo deschauisitz e braus,
Quan venc sai sus per osteiar."

Though Autafort is not mentioned by name in either sirventes, the words *sai* ('here') in the first passage, and still more *sai sus* ('up here') in the second passage, can leave no doubt that Bertran's stronghold is meant. As its name implies, it was perched on an eminence.

1183, after a week's siege, and which Richard returned to Bertran's brother Constantine, who had been driven out of it by Bertran's treachery.² The capture of Autafort was the closing scene, as it were, in the campaign of 1183 waged by Richard, with the assistance of his father Henry II, against the malcontent barons of Aquitaine, including Bertran de Born, who had been driven to rebellion by the iron rule of Richard, the King's representative in that part of the royal domains, and who were endeavoring, in alliance with young Henry, the eldest son of Henry II, known as the "Young King" since his coronation by anticipation at Westminster in 1170, to set up the younger Henry, a prince according to their own heart, as duke of Aquitaine in Richard's stead. With the unexpected death from enteric fever of the Young King, on July 11, 1183, the league of the insurgents collapsed and the war was virtually over. But though Bertran, who belonged to the lowest grade of the nobility, was of very little account from the military point of view, the duke was bent on punishing him for the part he had taken in egging on the rebels by his fiery songs. However, it was not long before Richard granted Bertran his full forgiveness and Autafort was restored to him, with Richard's acquiescence, by King Henry, whom the Young King on his dying bed had besought to extend his mercy to all his enemies in the recent rebellion. Abandoned by his friends and allies in the closing stage of the struggle and moved by the duke's clemency, Bertran made peace with Richard and promised thenceforth to place his lyre and sword at the service of the ducal house—an attitude from which he never departed in the future.

Alphonso had probably espoused the Angevin cause in the war against the rebel barons of Aquitaine out of opposition to Raymond V, count of Toulouse (1148-94), who had brought reinforcements to the Young King in the campaign of 1183³ and with whose house that of Barcelona had a long-standing feud over the ownership of the county of Provence. The kings of Aragon and counts of Barcelona were the natural allies of the early Angevins, with whom they had common interests in their hostility to the powerful house of Toulouse,

² The siege and capture of Autafort and Alphonso's presence there are recorded by Geoffrey of Vigeois (*Chronicon*, p. 337), a neighbor of the troubadour, the only chronicler to mention these events or Bertran's name at all.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 336.

as well as in their possessions and appenages in the south of France. Thus it came about that Ramon-Berenguer IV, count of Barcelona and regent of Aragon, a potentate ranking on an equality with kings, was one of Henry II's most valued allies when, in 1159, Henry II attempted to enforce the shadowy claims of his wife Eleanor, duchess of Aquitaine, on the county of Toulouse. In order to secure the services of the count in this arduous enterprise, which, as it turned out, was to end in failure, Henry II had agreed that Ramon-Berenguer's infant daughter, sister of Alphonso II, should in due time be wedded to his son Richard, then a baby a few months old, and that the duchy of Aquitaine should be settled on the young pair when the marriage came to be celebrated.⁴ A still more striking proof of the friendly relations existing between the two houses is furnished by a clause in Ramon-Berenguer's will, by which he leaves his three sons, of whom Alphonso II was the eldest and was to succeed him, as well as all his lands, under the protection of the king of England, his friend.⁵ It may also be mentioned that some ten years later (1173) Henry II acted as peacemaker in a dispute between Alphonso II and Raymond V of Toulouse, to the great disadvantage of the count, who paid the price of the royal mediation by swearing that he would henceforth be "the man of the King, and of the new king his son, and of the count of Poitiers, to hold Toulouse of them."⁶

As to the presence of Alphonso II at the siege of Autafort, at a time when the rebellion in Aquitaine was to all intents and purposes broken and his services would be no longer necessary, it is best accounted for by personal enmity toward Bertran de Born: Alphonso had an old score to pay off against the troubadour. For was it not Bertran who, in his first extant sirventes (*Lo coms m'a mandat e mogul*), barely two years before the capture of Autafort, had incited, at the bidding of the count of Toulouse, the Aquitanian barons to take up arms against the king of Aragon who had invaded the count's territories and was threatening Toulouse itself? The king of Aragon would not easily forget either certain personal insults aimed at him by Bertran in this

⁴ For further details see J. H. Ramsay, *The Angevin empire*, p. 19.

⁵ H. Schäfer, *Geschichte von Spanien*, III, 44. The will is quoted by Bofarull, *Condes de Barcelona* (Barcelona, 1836), p. 208, and summarized by Zurita, *Annales de la Corona de Aragón* (1610), II, 20.

⁶ *Gesta*, I, 35-36.

earlier sirventes, such as *lo reis qu'a Tarasco perduto* (vs. 37), or the designation of his brother Sancho, his lieutenant in Provence, as *frair del rei vencut* (vs. 42). For his part Bertran de Born, a good hater if there ever was one, never forgave Alphonso, who was not directly involved, for having lent help to Richard in the capture of Autafort, though there appears to be no evidence to justify the statement of the author of the *Razo* or commentary to the first of the two sirventes who declares that the troubadour had been forced to surrender his castle because of the king of Aragon's treachery.⁷ From now on Bertran's dislike of Alphonso turned to blind and bitter hatred, so that most of the accusations leveled by the troubadour at Alphonso's public and private life will be found, as we shall see presently, to be pure slanders on the character of a monarch who has left an honored name in the annals of his country as a vigorous and upright ruler. Even Alphonso's patronage—attested by numerous troubadours⁸—of the Provençal lyric, which he himself practiced in his leisure hours, could find no favor with Bertran who, in an isolated strophe of another sirventes (*Mout m'es deissendre*), composed soon after the two with which we are more particularly concerned, goes out of his way to heap further abuse on the king of Aragon and to deride him for the high opinion he had, so Bertran alleges, of his own poetic powers.⁹

Referring directly as they do to the siege of Autafort, in July, 1183, Bertran's two sirventes must have been written soon after the capture

⁷ According to the author of the *Razo*, what happened was briefly this: When Bertran knew that the king of Aragon was in the army of King Henry II before Autafort (as a matter of fact Henry II was not present at the siege of Autafort), he rejoiced greatly, because the king of Aragon was his especial friend. And it came to pass that the besiegers ran short of food, and Alphonso sent word to Bertran beseeching him to send bread and wine and meat. Bertran willingly complied and in return begged the king of Aragon to have the war engines turned in another direction, as that part of the walls of Autafort which they were attacking threatened to collapse. But the treacherous Alphonso, bribed by the presents and money given to him by King Henry, lost no time in betraying the secret which Bertran had confided to him, whereupon Henry increased the number of engines directed against the broken part of the walls, which immediately fell to the ground, and Autafort was captured.

⁸ See A. Jeanroy, *Les troubadours en Espagne*, p. 655 of the offprint.

⁹ The strophe in question runs as follows:

"Aragones fan gran dol,
Catala e cili d'Urgel
Quar non an qui los chapdel
Mas un senhor flac e gran,
Tal que.s lauza en chantan
E vol mals deniers qu'onor
E pendet son ancessor,
Per que.s destrui et enferna.."

of that stronghold; and as they both begin with a spring-opening, the early part of the year 1184 is almost certainly the date of their composition.¹⁰

We shall now proceed to examine each of them in detail, making use of Appel's text, the best so far, as a basis for discussion.¹¹

I. PUOIS LO GENS
TERMINIS FLORITZ

(Contained in MSS ABCDEFIK)

10 Sos bas paratges sobreissitz
Sai que fenira coma lais
E tornara lai don si traïs:
A Melhau et en Carlades.

When Bertran wrote of Alphonso "His low upstart race I know will end like a *lai* and he will return where he came from: to Millau and the country of Carlat," his object was to belittle Alphonso by drawing attention to his lowly descent, on his grandmother's side, from the little viscounts of Carlat and Millau in Aveyron, which came about as follows: in 1081 Gerberge, sister of Bertran, count of Provence, who had died without issue, married Gilbert, viscount of Carlat and Millau, and brought him Arles and the southern part of Provence. In 1112 Gerberge, being a widow, made over all her lands to her daughter, Douce, on the latter's marriage with Ramon-Berenguer III, count of Barcelona (1093–1130), to whom soon after his wife transferred all her possessions. By Douce Ramon-Berenguer had two sons. The elder, Ramon-Berenguer IV (1131–62), father of King Alphonso of Aragon, inherited the county of Barcelona, to which he added Aragon by his betrothal in 1137 to Petronilla, daughter and heiress of Ramiro II, king of Aragon, whom he married in 1150, though he never actually assumed the title of "king," being content to style himself "Prince of Aragon." The other son, Berenguer-Ramon (1130–44), had as his share the county of Provence together with Arles and the viscounty of Carlat and Millau, which in 1166 all devolved upon Alphonso II (who had ascended the throne of Aragon in 1162), at the death of his cousin, Ramon-Berenguer II (1144–66), in 1166.

¹⁰ It is not possible to decide which of the two comes first chronologically; neither does it matter very much. Like other commentators, I have placed *Puois lo gens terminis floritz* first, because the *Razo* of the other sirventes refers back to it.

¹¹ *Die Lieder Bertrans von Born*, neu herausgegeben von Carl Appel (Halle, 1932).

The *lai*, it should be recalled, was a kind of poem in which the last strophe reproduced the metrical structure of the first, while the intervening strophes were all different in form. Thus Bertran's words imply that after many vicissitudes the house of King Alphonso will finally sink into the insignificant beginnings from which it was sprung, a prophecy which, needless to say, was never realized.¹²

14 Quan quecs n'aura son drech conques,
An s'en ves Sur!

Sur, today Sour, is the name given in the Middle Ages to Tyre on the coast of Syria. When every claimant will have taken back what is his due from the king of Aragon, exclaims Bertran ironically, let him go to Palestine, like many other adventurers who joined the Crusades in the hope of grabbing some land in those parts.

16 Mas grieu er qu'en mar nol debur
L'aura, quar tan es pauc arditz,
Flacs e vas e sojornaditz.

The meaning of *deburar* (SW,¹³ II, 21b), if such a verb really exists, is unknown. The best suggestion so far is that of Chabaneau (RLR, XXXI, 609), who proposes tentatively to emend to *depur* in the sense of 'to purge,' here as the effect of fear. Though *depurar* ('dépurer,' 'épurer'; cf. 'un remède dépuratif') is not attested in OFr (see Wartburg, FEW [III, 45], *depurare*, 'reinigen') or in OP, it occurs in all the other Romance languages and in modern Provençal: "but it will hardly be that the storm on the sea does not clean him out, for he is so lacking in pluck, feeble and weak and slack."

19 Proenza pert, don es eissitz,
Que so fair Sanso prezan mais.

The wish is father to the thought when Bertran declares that Alphonso II of Aragon is losing Provence, which, as we have seen, had passed into his family (hence Bertran's *don es eissitz*) by the marriage in 1112 of his grandfather, Ramon-Berenguer III, with Douce, heiress of Provence; and to which Alphonso had successfully maintained his

¹² S. Strónski (*Le troubadour Folquet de Marseille* [Cracovie, 1910], pp. 223-24) was the first to show that *lais* in this passage is not the adjective *lais* ('ugly,' 'hateful'), but the noun *lais*, designating a special kind of poem.

¹³ SW = E. Levy, *Provençalischs Supplement-Wörterbuch* (continued by C. Appel) Leipzig, 1894-1924.

rights by force of arms against Raymond V, count of Toulouse. Perhaps Bertran's purpose was to suggest that Sancho, Alphonso's brother and his representative in Provence, had so far gained the affection of the people that Alphonso was losing his hold on that part of his domains. If so, this might explain why in 1185 Alphonso took away his charge from Sancho and entrusted it to his cousin, the count of Foix.¹⁴ But there is no reason to believe that Sancho was popular; on the contrary. It is more likely that Sancho was deposed because of his incompetence, as we may infer from a song of Peire Vidal in which Alphonso is warned and Sancho taken to task for preying on his trust: "Francs reis, Proensa.us apella, Qu'en Sancho la.us desclavella,/ Qu'el en trai la cer' e.l mel/E sai tramet vos lo fel" (ed. Anglade², No. XVI).

21 Qu'el non a sonh mas que s'engrais
E beva per Rossilhones,
On fo deseretatz Jaufres.

The implication that Alfonso was a glutton and a carouser is disproved by what is known of his character; he was a man of temperate habits, and gained the surname of "el Casto" on account of his continence. As for the second charge, while it is true that Count Geoffrey of Roussillon was deprived of his possessions and replaced in 1163 by his son Guinard II, Bertran omits to say that this had come about because Geoffrey had been excommunicated for having arbitrarily repudiated his wife and married another woman. In 1172, on Guinard's death, the county of Roussillon, which Guinard had willed to Alphonso II, became part of the Aragonese domains.¹⁵

24 Qu'a Vilamur
En Tolsal tenon per perjur
Tuit cilh ab cui s'era plevitz,
Quar los a per paor giquitz.

There is nothing in any of the chroniclers which might shed some light on this allegation, which is probably a pure fabrication. A possible explanation is that during one of the campaigns between Alphonso II and Raymond V, count of Toulouse, over the ownership of Provence, Alphonso had made promises to certain discontented feudatories of

¹⁴ *Histoire de Languedoc*, Vol. VI, *passim*, and *Art de vérifier les dates*, IX, 435-36.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, III, 8.

the count of Toulouse, which he had broken for fear of displeasing his ally, the king of England, Raymond's enemy.

Lo reis cui es Castrorasoritz
E te de Toleta.l palais
30 Lau que mostre de sos eslais
Sai al filh del Barsalones
Quar per drech son malvatz om es.

In verse 30 there can be no doubt, I think, that *essais* of the other group (CE) of manuscripts should be adopted instead of *eslais*, which cannot mean 'eifrige Tat' (Appel, *Lieder*, Gloss.), much less 'Heldentat' (Stimming¹⁶) or 'exploit' (Thomas),¹⁷ whereas *essai*, *assai*, not infrequently assumes the latter meaning, though it is not noted by any of the dictionaries. The word has that value in song 26, verse 48, and still more obviously in *Flamenca* (vss. 7043-44):

De Guillem de Nevers retrais
Las grans proezas els assais.

Bertran's declaration in the last verse to the effect that Alphonso was the liegeman of the king of Castile, "the king to whom belongs Castrojeriz [a town in Castile] and the palace of Toledo," was untrue at the time he wrote the present piece; Alphonso II, and his father Ramon-Berenguer before him, did homage to the king of Castile, but Alphonso II was relieved of this obligation by the treaty of 1177 between himself and Alphonso VIII of Castile—an event recorded by a chronicler of repute as one of the outstanding achievements of Alphonso's reign.¹⁸ However, from the context it is permissible to conclude that Bertran was aware of the facts but wished to convey that, though Alphonso was no longer the king of Castile's vassal, he ought still, by rights, to be in that subordinate position.

De.l rei tafur
Pretz mais sa cort e son atur,
35 No fatz cela don fui trāitz
Lo jorn qu'el fo per me servitz.

"Of the king of beggars I value more highly the court and its doings than I do that of the man by whom I was betrayed the day that I

¹⁶ The three editions (1879, 1892, 1913) of Bertran de Born's poems by A. Stimming are quoted as Stimming¹, Stimming², and Stimming³, respectively.

¹⁷ A. Thomas, *Poésies complètes de Bertran de Born* (Toulouse, 1888).

¹⁸ Schäfer, III, 50 and 53.

rendered him a service." There is no record anywhere which might suggest that Bertran was ever on friendly terms with Alphonso or rendered him any service and was betrayed in return, except the account, obviously invented to suit the occasion, by the author of the *Razo* of what happened between Alphonso and Bertran at the siege of Autafort (cf. n. 7).

Lo bos reis Garsia Ramitz
Cobrera, quan vida.lh sofrais,
Arago, que.l monges l'estrais,
40 El bos reis navars, cui drechs es,
Cobrara ab sos Alaves,
Sol s'i atur.

The historical facts, distorted by Bertran to suit his own ends, are briefly as follows: at the beginning of the eleventh century Sancho Garcés III, the Great, king of Navarre (1000-1035), had brought under his sway or influence the greater part of Christian Spain. Before his death Sancho Garcés divided his empire among his sons: García, the eldest of his legitimate sons, received Navarre; Ferdinand, the county of Castile; Ramiro, a bastard, the county of Aragon; and Gonzalo, the counties of Sobrarbe and Ribagorza to the east of Aragon, which passed to Ramiro on Gonzalo's death. Soon after, Ramiro assumed the royal title and thus became the first king of Aragon. He was succeeded in 1063 by his son Sancho Ramirez, who died in 1094. Meanwhile, in Navarre, García had been followed on the throne by his son Sancho Garcés IV, the Noble (1054-76). After the murder of Sancho Garcés by his brother Ramon and his partisans, the helpless Navarrese, Sancho's sons being but infants and the enemy at their door, elected as their sovereign king Sancho Ramirez of Aragon, and by so doing brought about the incorporation of Navarre in the kingdom of Aragon. On the death of Sancho Ramirez in 1094, his son Pedro ascended the throne and was followed in 1104 by his brother Alphonso I, "el Batallador," who ruled for thirty years. When Alphonso I died (September 7, 1134), the Aragonese chose as his successor his youngest brother Ramiro II (1134-37), bishop-elect of Roda, surnamed the "Monk" because he had been brought up in a monastery. The people of Navarre, on the other hand, convinced that the "Monk" was not the man to protect them against the growing power

of Castile, and eager now to recover their national independence, elected a king of their own, in the person of García Ramírez (called "Garsia Ramitz" by Bertran de Born), a grandson of a brother of their former king, Sancho Garcés, the Noble. From that moment Navarre, after having been united to Aragon for close on sixty years, became again an independent kingdom. García Ramírez was succeeded on the throne of Navarre by his son Sancho VI, surnamed "the Wise" (1150-94), whom Bertran calls "the good Navarrese king" (vs. 40), his contemporary in Aragon being Alfonso II.

From this brief summary it will be seen that Bertran's account is entirely unreliable. It is untrue to assert, as he does, that the "Monk" (Ramiro II) had stolen Aragon from García Ramírez of Navarre, or that it belonged by right to the then king of Navarre (Sancho VI). Perhaps Bertran wished to imply that since Aragon, in the days of Sancho Garcés the Great, had belonged to Navarre, it ought to revert to its former owners. It would have been nearer the truth to maintain that, by detaching Navarre from Aragon, García Ramírez had stolen Navarre from the "Monk," though here Bertran might have retorted with some effect that the absorption in 1076 of Navarre by Aragon was not wholly voluntary as far as the Navarrese were concerned. The hope expressed by Bertran that Sancho the Wise of Navarre will win back the land which once belonged to his ancestors was to prove vain; far from recovering Aragon, Sancho VI was hard put to it, from the first day of his reign, to maintain the independence of his kingdom against the repeated onslaughts of Castile and Aragon, acting either singly or in concert, begun during his father's reign, although all three families were closely allied by marriage.

Contrary to what one would conclude from verse 41, the inhabitants of the Basque province of Alava, which had formerly belonged to Castile, were longing to throw off the oppressive rule of the kings of Navarre. When some fifteen years later Alfonso VIII of Castile, taking advantage of the absence of Sancho VII of Navarre (1194-1234) in Morocco, where he had gone in the hope of enlisting the help of the Moors, marched into the territory of Navarre and conquered the Basque provinces, the Alavese sided with the invader and welcomed their reunion with Castile, from which they had been severed

for some fourscore years.¹⁹ *Cobrara.l* of MS A in verse 41, with Stimming²⁰ and Thomas, seems indispensable.

46 Per cela de cui es maritz,
Per la bona reina.m lais,
E des que.m dis so don m'apais.

The wife of Alphonso II of Aragon was Sancha of Castile, daughter of Alphonso VII (1126-57), the "Emperor," of Castile and Leon, by his second wife, Rica, daughter of king Wladislaw II of Poland, and aunt of Alphonso VIII of Castile (1158-1214). Perhaps one of the reasons why Bertran shows sympathy for Sancha and taxes Alphonso with breaking his vows (in vs. 45 he calls him *reis apostitz*) is because the latter, incensed that Alphonso VIII of Castile had broken the treaty made between them in 1172 and directed against Pedro Ruiz de Azagra (see note to vs. 49 of the second sirventes), had in a fit of temper repudiated his engagement with Sancha and offered his hand to the Greek princess Eudoxia (see note to vss. 55-63). Soon after, however, Alphonso of Aragon became reconciled with his namesake of Castile and was united to Sancha (January 18, 1174), who should not be confused, by the way, with her half-sister of the same name, who married Sancho VI of Navarre and was the daughter of Berengeria, first wife of Alphonso VII of Castile and the half-sister of Alphonso II of Aragon.²⁰ With regard to verses 47-48, we have no clue of any kind as to the comforting words which Queen Sancha of Aragon may have spoken to Bertran de Born.

Berengier de Besaudunes
50 Li retraiissera, si.lh plagues;
Mas tot recur
Sos malvatz fachs, que son tafur,
Quar per el fo mortz e träitz,
Don es sos linhatges aunitz.

Besaudunes is the district of Besaudun (Lat. *Bisuldunum*), now Besalù, in Catalonia, inherited by Ramon-Berenguer III, grandfather of Alphonso II of Aragon, from Bernard III, count of Besaudun, his son-in-law, on Bernard's death in 1111. In 1162 Ramon-Berenguer IV left the county of Besaudun specifically to his wife Petronilla,²¹ from

¹⁹ F. W. Schirrmacher, *Geschichte von Spanien*, IV, 268-69.

²⁰ Schäfer, III, 51-52.

²¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 44 and 303.

whom it seems to have passed, if we are to believe the *Razo*, to the second son of Ramon-Berenguer, called Ramon-Berenguer after his father, brother of Alphonso II of Aragon, whose deputy he was in Provence (before Sancho, Alphonso's other brother), from 1168 until 1181, when he was ambushed and killed along with some of his knights—his friends said murdered—by the son of the lord of Murviel near Béziers, a partisan of Raymond V, count of Toulouse. The accusation (vss. 53–54) that Alphonso had a hand in his brother's death is a pure calumny; on the contrary, as soon as Alphonso heard of his brother's fate he laid siege to the castle of Murviel, captured it and razed it to the ground.²²

In verse 51, missing in CE, all the six manuscripts have *recur*, except B (*reñcur*) and F (*retur*). Both Stimming³ and Thomas adopt *reñcurar*. Stimming renders it unwarrantably by 'brandmarken'; Thomas by 'déplorer,' 'regretter,' suggested no doubt by Mistral's *rancura*, 'reprocher,' 'réclamer'; 'plaindre,' 'regretter.' But *reñcur* occurs in one manuscript only, and the meaning attributed by Thomas to the word is doubtful. I would suggest retaining *recur* and render (placing a comma instead of a semicolon after *plagues*, and taking *mas* = 'since,' a not uncommon use of the word): "Berengier of Besaudun I might cast in his teeth, if it pleased him, since I am cleaning up his wicked deeds, which are those of a knave, for through him he was done to death and betrayed, wherefore his lineage is disgraced." Appel (as above) adopts *recur*, which he renders (*Lieder*, Gloss.) by 'wieder reinigen, wieder in Ordnung bringen,' erroneously I think, as *re-* in *reñcurar* has not iterative force any more than in French *récurer*. Moreover, with a semicolon after *plagues* and *mas* not in the sense of 'since' (see his Glossary under *mas*), I cannot see how he interprets the passage.

Mout tráit lais l'emperairitz
Com fals reis prejurs e savais,
Quan pres a quintals et a fais
L'aver que Manuels trames
E la rauba et tot l'arnes;
60 Puois ab cor dur,
Quan n'ac trach lo vert e.l madur,
El n'enviet per mar marritz
La domna e.ls Grees que ac tráitz.

²² De Vigeois, p. 326, and *Gesta comitum Barcinonensis*, chap. xxii.

In view of the rather meager notes of Stimming³ (p. 173) and Thomas (p. 47), the allusions contained in this strophe require some amplification, as well as rectification: Alphonso II of Aragon, as we have seen, having fallen out momentarily with his old ally Alphonso VIII of Castile, suddenly broke off his engagement with Sancha of Castile, and asked for the hand of Eudoxia, daughter of the emperor of Constantinople, Manuel Comnenius (1143-80). The marriage was duly arranged and the princess set out on her long journey accompanied by an imposing retinue bearing numerous and costly presents. But when Eudoxia and her ambassadors arrived at Montpellier, on their way to meet the bridegroom, they learned to their amazement and discomfiture that Alphonso, now reconciled with his namesake of Castile, had in the meantime changed his mind and had wedded Sancha of Castile (January 18, 1174). In their dilemma they turned for advice to the lord of Montpellier, Guilhem VIII (1172-1202), who in his turn referred the matter to his councilors. Their advice was that their master should offer his hand to the disconsolate princess, which he did. The Greek ambassadors, taken aback, demurred at first, because the lord of Montpellier was not of royal rank, declaring at the same time that they had promised the Emperor to bring back the princess if by any chance the proposed marriage with Alphonso did not materialize. But Guilhem pressed his suit so hotly that in the end Eudoxia's advisers acquiesced, on condition that the first child born of the union should inherit the lordship of Montpellier. These facts are related in detail in the memoirs of King Jacme I of Aragon (1213-76), grandson of Guilhem and Eudoxia.²³ King Jacme does not mention his grandmother's name, but we know from other sources that it was Eudoxia. Her relationship to Emperor Manuel Comnenius is not absolutely certain, and has given rise to some controversy.²⁴ The chronicler Guillaume de Puylaurens calls her "neptem Emmanuelis imperatoris Constantinopolitani."²⁵ On the other hand, the *Chronica* speaks of a "daughter of the Emperor," and as the author, King Jacme of Aragon, was so closely related to Eudoxia, his statement seems decisive. Moreover, the *Razo* to the present sirventes, as well

²³ *Chronica o commentari del glor. et invict. Rey en Jacme*, chap. 1.

²⁴ On this question see J. Laurent, *Annales du Midi*, XXIII, 333, and in reply, S. Stroński, *ibid.*, p. 491.

²⁵ *Rec. hist. Fr.*, XIX, 201.

as that to a song of Folquet de Marseille, agrees with the *Chronica*, while the title of "empress" given to Eudoxia by the troubadours generally points rather to a daughter than to a niece of the Emperor of Constantinople and is in perfect accord with the practice usual with them of transferring her father's rank to a royal princess married to a man below royal rank, as was the case with Eudoxia.

After twelve years of conjugal life, Guilhem of Montpellier disowned Eudoxia, alleging her infidelity as a pretext and had her shut up in the monastery of Aniane. By a strange fatality, the daughter of Guilhem and Eudoxia, Marie by name, widowed in 1197, united three years later to the reprobate count of Comminges and cast off by him, married in 1204, as her third husband, King Pedro of Aragon (1196-1214), son of Alphonso II, who also repudiated her after she had borne him a son who was to be Jaeme I of Aragon, surnamed the "Conqueror." Bertran's declaration that Alphonso sent back Eudoxia to Greece is unfounded, as is also the statement that he appropriated the presents and money her father had sent with her.

Of the various troubadours who mention the "Empress," the only one, besides Bertran de Born, to single out the circumstances attending the projected union with Alphonso of Aragon is Peire Vidal, in a song composed shortly before Bertran's sirventes; but, being a protégé of Alphonso, Peire Vidal takes a different point of view and approves of the King's conduct toward Eudoxia. "I would rather have," exclaims Vidal, "a wee maiden from Castile than the empire of Manuel together with a thousand camels laden with gold": *E plagra.m mais de Castela Una pauca jovensela, Que d'aur cargat mil camel Ab l'empiri Manuel* (ed. Anglade², p. 49).

In the last verse but one, all commentators interpret *marrit* as 'sad,' 'sorrowful,' as does also the author of the *Razo* (*los enviet per mar marritz e consiros e desconselhatz*). On account of *per mar* perhaps preference should be given to *marrit*, in the sense of 'égaré' 'errant' (*PD*,²⁶ and *SW*, *marrir* 2).

II. QUAN VEI PELS VERGIERS DESPLEIAR (Contained in MSS ACDFIKRTU)

Whereas in the first sirventes the public life of the king of Aragon is made the butt of Bertran's shafts, his object in the second sirventes

²⁶ *PD* = E. Levy, *Petit dictionnaire Provençal-Français*.

is to expose certain alleged disgraceful incidents in Alphonso's private life. It follows that the majority of these charges cannot be checked, because, even in the case of those which might contain an element of truth, they would have no historical interest and would remain unrecorded by contemporary chroniclers. For nearly all of them the only source of information at our disposal are the explanations of the author of the *Razos*. From what we know of his untrustworthiness as regards historical events which took place less than fifty years before he wrote, we may conclude that he is equally heedless of the truth in expanding—for that is all he does—Bertran de Born's aspersions on the private life of the king of Aragon.²⁷ To the author of the *Razo* they seemed good copy and he would not trouble to examine them critically, lest in the process they might lose some of their piquancy or turn out to be pure fabrications, which many of them, if not all, were, as a matter of fact. The authors of the longer *Razos* were novelists in their way: they took particular pleasure in embellishing as they thought fit the texts of the troubadours with fictitious additions of a romantic character or did not hesitate to accept on trust any of the sensational statements in them which suited their purpose.

7 Adones vuolh un sirventes far
Tals que.l coms Richartz l'entenda.

Although, as we have seen, Bertran had made peace with Richard, count of Poitiers and duke of Aquitaine, after the capture of Autafort, he could not resist the temptation of calling the count's attention to certain particularly odious acts which he proceeds to lay to Alphonso's charge, so that Richard might see what a precious ally he had in the person of the king of Aragon.

Ab me.l volon tuit encusar,
Qu'us mi comtet de sos vassaus
Que de Castellot ac mal laus,
20 Quan ne fetz n'Espanhol gitar.
E no.m par que si defenda
Ves el, s'el lo n'ausa proar;
E, quan entret per convidar,
Conquerit lai pauc de renda.

²⁷ On the unreliability of the *Razos* in general see A. Jeanroy, "Les 'biographies' des troubadours et les 'razos'; leur valeur historique," *Archivum Romanicum*, I, 289-306.

As of all the manuscripts, IKD, closely related, alone have the plural *mdls*, the reading *mal laus* (vs. 19), first proposed by Levy (ASNS, CXLIII, 96–97), with *laus* as the accusative singular of the indeclinable *laus*, is certainly right. The last six syllables of verse 22 appear as follows in the manuscripts: *si el nauza proar* (ADIK), *sil auza proar* (C), *si lo nauza proar* (F), *sil le nauza proar* (R), *sil nauzi proar* (T), from which we may perhaps conclude that the original reading was either *s'el lo n'aus' aproar* or *s'il n'ausa aproar*: 'if he dares to put him to the test in the matter.' In any case, if *proar* is retained (as above), it should be given the same value as *aproar* and cannot be rendered by 'anklagen' (Stimming³) or by 'zum Beweise heranziehen' (Appel, *Lieder*, Gloss.), neither of which can be substantiated. In the same verse there can be little doubt that *ves lui* of MSS AD (A being probably the best of all the manuscripts) should be adopted: it is hard to believe that Bertran's ear could have been satisfied with the jingle *ves el, s'el . . .*. In verses 23–24 Levy suggests that *quan* = 'since' and that *lai* might be replaced by *lag* of MS C (F has *laig*): 'and since he entered [the castle of Castellote] on invitation, he acquired in ugly fashion little income.' I do not think this is necessary as both *quan* and *lai* can very well have temporal value here. Taking into account these suggestions, the rendering of the whole strophe would be: "With me all men wish to impeach him, for one of his vassals told me that as regards Castellote [a castle in Aragon] he acquired an evil reputation, since he had sir Espanhol thrown out of it. And it does not seem to me that he can defend himself against him, if he dares to bring him to book in the matter; and when he entered on invitation he earned no great revenue on that occasion."

Gastos, cui es Bearns e Paus,
Mi trames sai novas comtar
Que de sos pres pres esmenda
30 De.l rei, que.ls i degra liurar,
E volc en mais l'aver portar
Que om totz sos pres li renda.

Levy (ASNS, CXLIII, 97–98) gives several alternative renderings of this passage, unnecessarily complicated, because, as it seems to me, he has allowed himself to be misled by the account of the matter in the *Razo*, which represents the incident in question as involving the

count of Toulouse, for which there is no foundation either in history or in the poem itself. On the other hand, it is known that Viscount Gaston VI of Béarn (1173-1215) joined the rebels, of which Bertran was one, in the insurrection of 1183, directed against the authority of Richard and his father in Aquitaine,²⁸ and that Alphonso II of Aragon was the ally of Richard and his father. From the mention of Gaston in verse 27, it is manifest that it was he and not the count of Toulouse who had captured some of Alphonso's men: "Gaston to whom belongs Béarn and Pau sent here to tell me that he [Alphonso] received from the King [Henry II] ransom-money for his prisoners, so that he [Gaston] should deliver them up to him [*i*]; and he [Alphonso] preferred to take away the money than that one should give back to him all his prisoners." The equation *i* = *li* has been questioned because the few examples of this use of the word, when isolated, are by no means certain;²⁹ but this objection can be met by taking *i* = 'there,' i.e., in Béarn, where presumably the ransom for the delivery of the prisoners was handed to Gaston.

Que so m'an dich de lui joglar
 Qu'en perdo an fachs totz lor laus.
 S'anc lor det vestirs vertz no blaus
 Ni lor fetz nul denier donar,
 Lait l'es qu'on l'en sobreprenda;
 Que d'un sol s'en saup be paiar:
 D'Artuset, don fai a blasmar,
 40 Qu'en mes als Juzieus en venda.

To understand this strophe properly it is necessary to recall what the author of the *Razo* has to say about the matter. According to him, Artuset was a minstrel who had lent Alphonso two hundred maravedis. More than a year had passed without Alphonso's returning the money when one day Artuset and a companion came into conflict with some Jews and in the struggle killed one of them. The Jews complained to Alphonso and offered to pay him two hundred maravedis should he deliver Artuset and his friend up to them. Alphonso, we are told, accepted their proposal and took the money, while the Jews burned Artuset and his companion on Christmas Day. Bertran's in-

²⁸ Cf. my article "Concerning two sirventes of Bertran de Born," *MP*, XXIX (1931), 6.

²⁹ See A. von Elsner, *Ueber Form und Verwendung des personal Pronomens im Altprovenzalischen* (1886), p. 51.

tention is to show that whatever insignificant gifts Alphonso may have doled out to the minstrels in general, these were more than compensated by the bribe he received from the Jews, and at the same time to put down to the king of Aragon one more dastardly action. The author of the *Razo* quotes some lines from a poem, which has not come down to us, of the Catalan troubadour Guilhem de Berguedan, in confirmation of his accusation that the Jews burned Artuset and his companion; but it must be remembered that Guilhem de Berguedan was also an enemy of Alphonso II of Aragon, who was his overlord and with whom he had quarreled.

Levy (*SW*, VII, 717-18), quoting the text of Stimming³, tacitly places a comma after *sobreprenda* and states that for verse 37 there are only two possible renderings: either (a) "es missfällt ihm, dass man ihn in Bezug darauf ertappe, nämlich beim Schenken, d.h. er will nichts von Schenken wissen"; or (b), ironically, "es missfällt ihm, dass man ihn deshalb tadle, d.h. wegen der in seinen Augen tadeln-werthen Freigebigkeit," though he confesses his inability to explain the whole passage. Levy, I submit, has been led astray by placing a comma after *sobreprenda* and taking *Que* (vs. 38) in the sense of 'for,' 'because.' The meaning appears to me clear enough if *Que* is made to depend on *sobreprenda* (which, of course, entails the deletion of the comma or of any punctuation after that word) and if *en* is taken as pleonastic and as referring to the following *que*-clause.³⁰ In that case the rendering of the whole strophe would run as follows, with *sobreprendre alcuna re* in the well-attested meaning (*SW*, *sobreprendre* 2) of 'to detect,' 'to catch in the act': "for this minstrels have told me about him: that in vain have they expended all their praises upon him; if ever he gave them garments green or blue or a single denier, it is hateful to him that one should find him out in that he managed to get handsomely repaid by means of a single minstrel, by means of Artuset (for which he deserves to be blamed), whom he sold to the Jews on that account [i.e., to get paid]."³¹ One might also, with Diez,³¹ understand *sobreprendre* (the *Don. prov.*, 35b, 36, glosses it as *reprehendere vel subito prendere*) in the sense of 'to blame'; but

³⁰ Cf. O. Schultz-Gora, *Provenzalische Studien*, II, 107.

³¹ *Leben und Werke der Troubadours* (Leipzig, 1882), p. 181.

this interpretation seems precluded by the fact that the notion of reprehension is already expressed in verse 39. As his translation (*Bertran von Born*, p. 46)³² shows, Appel, by placing a semicolon after *sobreprendre* (as above), like Levy, makes verse 37 refer to the statement which precedes (i.e., the gift of clothes and money) and also makes *Que* (vs. 38) = 'for.' Moreover, he understands the *Que* of the last verse as a conjunction ('that') and not as the relative pronoun: "Das haben Spielleute mir von ihm erzählt, dass sie sein Lob vergeblich sangen, denn, gab er ihnen einmal bunte Kleider und liess er ihnen einen Pfennig zahlen, so will er doch darin nicht übers Ohr gehauen sein, vielmehr macht er durch Einen sich bezahlt: durch Artus, von dem es schändlich ist, dass er (Alphons) den Juden verkauft." Though his interpretation of *don fai a blasmar* (which carries with it *Que* = 'that' in the next verse) can be defended (cf. SW, III, 385b), I do not see how he manages to extract *übers Ohr hauen* ('to cheat,' 'to rob') out of *sobreprendre*, which, however, he abandons in *Lieder* (Gloss.), in favor of 'uberrumpeln' with a query.

Peire joglar saup mal paiar,
Que lh preset deniers e chavaus,
Que la vielha que Font-Ebraus
Aten, lo fetz tot pesseiar;
45 Qu'anc l'entresehns fachs ab benda
De la jupa del rei d'armar
Que lh balhet, no lo puoc guizar,
Qu'om ab coutels tot no.l fenda.

All commentators without exception (Thomas, p. 51; Stimming³, p. 174; Andresen, *ZRPh*, XIV, 195; Appel, *Bertran von Born*, p. 46, and *Lieder*, p. 133, etc.), save Diez (who sees in her the widowed Empress Mathilda),³³ refer *la vielha* (vs. 43) to Eleanor of Aquitaine, wife of Henry II; and interpret *aten* as 'awaits': "the old woman whom Fontevrault awaits." The author of the *Razo* also refers *la vielha* to the "queen of England" without however specifying Eleanor, and adds that the minstrel Peter had spoken ill of her. Though Eleanor

³² Carl Appel, *Bertran von Born* (Halle, 1931), p. 46.

³³ P. 181. This is impossible: the Empress Mathilda, mother of Henry II, died in 1167; at that time Richard was not yet Count of Poitou (he was not installed as such until June, 1172), whereas the present sirventes (cf. vss. 7-8) is addressed to "count" Richard.

of Aquitaine was over sixty when (1184) the present sirventes was written and the epithet "old" was not therefore inappropriate at that date, I cannot bring myself to believe that Bertran de Born, who was now on friendly terms with Richard, would have dared, even if he had felt so inclined, to speak of Richard's mother, whom her son loved dearly, as "the old woman" *tout court*. Moreover, Eleanor at that time was still a state prisoner in England and kept in confinement by her husband as a punishment for the treacherous part she had played in the rebellion of 1173 in Aquitaine by instigating her sons against their father. Henry had also an ulterior object in keeping his wife in detention; he did not want to be disturbed in his illicit intrigue with the fair Rosamond Clifford—which became notorious about this time³⁴—and, after Rosamond's death, with Alix of France, Richard's affianced bride, whom he had seduced.³⁵ Eleanor was not finally liberated until Richard's accession to the throne in 1189, after a captivity lasting sixteen years. Between 1173 and 1189 she was in France for a very short time, on two occasions only, in 1174 and in 1185, on show, so to speak, to suit Henry's purpose.³⁶ Under the circumstances it is hardly possible that Eleanor could have wreaked vengeance upon the minstrel in the way described by Bertran; or, as Stimming³ (p. 174) and Appel (*Bertran von Born*, p. 46 n.) surmise, that Eleanor's intended retirement to the famous abbey of Fontevrault on the confines of Anjou and Poitou was well known and regarded as imminent when Bertran wrote his sirventes. As a matter of fact, at no time did Eleanor actually retire to the abbey of Fontevrault, though in later life she was wont to make frequent stays there. Neither is it a serious argument to suppose, as Crescini does, that Bertran heard of Eleanor's act of vengeance only some twenty years after it had taken place, or to contend that, though Bertran's disrespectful designation of Eleanor might anger her favorite son, it could not fail to please her husband.³⁷ In view of these considerations, *la vielha*, I submit, does not refer to Eleanor of Aquitaine, but to the

³⁴ Ramsay, p. 260.

³⁵ On this unsavory subject, slurred over by British historians, see A. Cartellieri, *Philip II August, König von Frankreich* (Leipzig, 1899-1900), I, 209.

³⁶ Ramsay, pp. 165, 220, 223, 227, 265.

³⁷ *Nuove postille al trattato amoroso d'Andrea Cappellano* (Venezia, 1909), p. 70.

abbess of Fontevrault, who was then Mathilda, sister of Philip of Flanders; and if *que* (vs. 43) is taken as the pronominal adverb, standing in this case for the dative³⁸ (the MSS F and T actually read *cui*), and *atendre ad alcu* is interpreted in the sense of 'to pay attention to,' 'to heed,' 'to obey,' the rendering will be: "in evil fashion did he [Alphonso] manage to pay Peter the minstrel, who lent him money and horses, for the old woman whom Fontevrault obeys had him all cut to pieces." An alternative would be *Que la vielh'a qui Font-Ebraus Aten*, with *atendre* in the same sense and *qui=cui*, as often, a reading which entails but a very slight modification, if any, and has the advantage, by disposing of one of the two *que*'s, of making the line run much more smoothly.

In this connection it may be mentioned that Eleanor, who was buried at Fontevrault, did not die there, as Thomas, Stimming³⁹, Appel, and other commentators, state. She expired, in the spring of the year 1204, being then about eighty-two years of age, at Poitiers, the capital of her hereditary domains, a few months before the town fell into the hands of Philippe-Auguste, king of France.⁴⁰

As we have no clue whatever to the incident described in verses 45-48, it is impossible to say whether it was the minstrel Peter who gave the sign or badge to the King of Heralds in order to secure his intercession with the abbess of Fontevrault, or whether the dative before *balhar* (vs. 47) refers to the abbess:

Peire Röis saup devinar,
 50 A.l prim que.l vi joves reiaus,
 Que no seria arditz ni maus;
 E conoe lo al badalhar:
 Reis que badalh ni s'estenda
 Quan au de batalha parlar,
 Sembla ho fassa per vaneiar
 O qu'en armas no s'entenda.

There can be no doubt that the person referred to in the first verse is the well-known *ricohombre* Pedro Ruiz de Azagra, lord of the power-

³⁸ For a similar use of *que* in lieu of the dative of the relative pronoun cf. vss. 33-34 of the *planck* on the death of the Young King attributed to Bertran de Born:

"Celui que plac pel nostre marrimen
 Venir el mon nos traire d'encombrer."

³⁹ Ramsay, p. 404, and A. Richard, *Histoire des comtes de Poitou* (Paris, 1903), p. 437.

ful fortress of Albarracin, which had been bestowed on him about 1165 by King Abensahad, the Moslem ruler of Murcia and Valencia, for eminent services. The importance of the almost impregnable Albarracin as a frontier post; the independent spirit of its master, who styled himself defiantly "vassal of Holy Mary and Lord of Albarracin" and refused to do homage to any man; the fact that he had taken possession of some castles belonging to Castile; his friendly relations with the king of Navarre with whom they were then at war; his dealings with the Infidels—all roused the indignation of Alphonso VIII of Castile and his ally Alphonso II of Aragon. In 1172 they agreed by treaty to drive Pedro Ruiz out of his dominions; but they failed, as they did on several other occasions, partly because they could not come to terms as to the division of the spoils they hoped to gain, and partly because the lord of Albarracin had influential friends in Castile and Aragon as well as in Navarre.⁴⁰ In the next verse one can hardly accept *joves reiaus* in the rôle of an accusative singular, as Thomas (p. 51) proposes. Grammatical requirements would be met by construing: "as soon as he [Alphonso], as a royal youth, saw him [Pedro Ruiz]"—a very ugly and awkward construction, which one would hesitate to put down to Bertran. Perhaps the best course is to adopt Chabaneau's slight modification to *al prim que.l vi.l joves reiaus*: "as soon as the royal youth saw him [P. Ruiz]." For *mal* (vs. 51) which Stimming³ renders by 'feige' and Thomas by 'méchant,' 'mauvais,' see *SW*, *mal* 4 ('kriegerisch'). In verse 55 *vaneiar* (cf. *van* in vs. 30) expresses 'feebleness,' 'slackness,' rather than 'laziness' (Stimming³) or 'cowardice' (Thomas). *S'entendre en* in the next verse is rendered 'sich verstehen auf,' a meaning not attested elsewhere, by Stimming³ and also by Diez (p. 182). There seems to be no reason why the usual meaning ('to aspire to,' 'to be intent on') should not be applied here. Appel (*Lieder*, Gloss.) has 'Interesse haben für.'

Ieu lo.lh perdo, si.m fetz mal far
 A Catalas ni a Laraus.
 Puois le senher cui es Peitaus
 60 Lo.lh mandet, non auset als far.

⁴⁰ Schäfer, III, 48-51.

E reis que logier atenda
 De senhor, bel deu afanar;
 Et el vene sai per gazanhar
 Mais que per autra fazenda.

The *Laraus*, or "those of Lara," can only be the men of Pedro de Lara, son of Don Manrique de Lara (d. 1164), one of the most powerful grandes of Castile, and of Ermessinde, sister of Ermengarde, viscountess of Narbonne (1143-92). In 1177 Ermengarde had appointed Pedro as her heir, in place of his brother Aimeric, who had died that year without issue. That same year, seeing herself threatened by Raymond V of Toulouse, who, as her overlord, disputed her right to dispose of her possessions without his consent, she formed a coalition, with the help of Alphonso II of Aragon, against Raymond V; and six years later she and her nephew, assisted by his followers in Lara, joined the Aragonese and Catalan forces of Alphonso when he took up the cudgels for Richard the Lion-hearted during the revolt of 1183 in Aquitaine.⁴¹

The use in verse 62 of the transitive *afanar* in the sense of 'to gain with difficulty' is queried by Appel (*Lieder, Gloss.*); but the fact that it exists in modern Provençal, as Thomas (p. 51) points out (cf. Mistral, *Trésor: afana soun pain*, 'gagner son pain à la sueur de son front'), speaks in its favor. Consequently the rendering 'abarbeiten' (Stimming²) should be corrected to 'erarbeiten.' Appel prefers to take *afanar* here as an intransitive verb to which he ascribes the value 'Mühsal, Leid verursachen.' Compare his translation in *Bertran von Born*, p. 46: "doch einem König muss es hart ankommen, von einem Herrn Lohn zu erwarten." Thus a free rendering of the strophe would be: "I forgive him for the harm his Catalans and the men of Lara did me; he couldn't do otherwise, since he had to take his orders from the lord to whom belongs Poitou [Richard]. A King [Alphonso] who expects pay from a Lord [Richard] ought indeed to sweat for it; and he came here for the sake of gain rather than for any other purpose."

65 Vuolh, sapch.al reis et aprenda
 De son grat e fassa chantar
 Mo sirventes al rei navar,
 E per Castela l'estenda.

⁴¹ *Histoire de Languedoc*, VI, 70, 89, 139, and *Art de vérifier les dates*, IX, 459.

This, of course, is ironical. The king of Navarre, Sancho VI, was, as we have already had occasion to notice, the bitter enemy of Alphonso II of Aragon and of Alphonso VIII of Castile, both of whom never ceased planning how they might destroy him and divide Navarre between them. Bertran expresses the desire that Alphonso of Aragon (*lo reis* of vs. 65) may learn his lampoon by heart and have it sung to the king of Navarre; and rubs it in by inviting Alphonso to spread it throughout Castile for the edification of his namesake and his subjects.

MANCHESTER, ENGLAND

JOHN DAY'S *LAW TRICKS* AND GEORGE WILKINS

M. E. BORISH

THE view that George Wilkins collaborated with Day in the composition of two plays, *Law tricks* (printed 1608) and *Humour out of breath* (printed 1608), has of late been gaining ground and is likely, unless opposed, to become fixed. Wilkins' participation in *Law tricks* is held to be more certain than his participation in *Humour*. In this paper the validity of the view that Wilkins was part-author of *Law tricks* will be considered.

The external evidence, such as it is, does not point to Wilkins' or any other's collaboration. The title-page of *Law tricks* bears John Day's name alone. The entry in the Stationers' Register does not give the dramatist's name,¹ the dedication of the play is unsigned, and there is no contemporary reference to the authorship of *Law tricks*.

The process of dividing the play between the two writers was begun in 1882 by Boyle,² who from a hint by Bullen³ inferred that *Law tricks* was related not only to *Pericles* (Wilkins' part-authorship of which he was seeking to establish) but to *The miseries of enforced marriage*,⁴ Wilkins' only certain independent play extant,⁵ and that Wilkins had assisted Day in the composition of *Law tricks*. Two external facts seemed to him to suggest the probability of this associa-

¹ Arber, *Transcript*, III, 372 (March 28, 1608).

² "On Wilkins's share in the play called Shakspere's *Pericles*," *New Shakspere Society Transactions*, Part II (1880-85), pp. 323-40. Boyle was not aware of Dellius' article on Wilkins, "Ueber Shakespeare's *Pericles, Prince of Tyre*," *Jahrbuch der deutschen Shakespeare-Gesellschaft*, III (1868), 175-204.

³ *The works of John Day* (London, 1881), pp. 96-97 (the pagination of the notes is continuous with that of the *Peregrinatio scholastica*). Bullen had already called attention to one of these passages in the *Athenaeum* (September 21, 1878, p. 368), where he expressed the opinion, reiterated in the note, that Day filched the passage from *Pericles* (printed 1609), not from Wilkins' novel (printed 1608) on the play. All references to Day's works are to Bullen's edition.

⁴ Entered in the Stationers' Register, July 31, 1607 (Arber, *Transcript*, III, 357) and printed in the same year.

⁵ For Wilkins' other works and for attributions to him, independent and collaborated, see H. D. Sykes, *Sidelights on Shakespeare* (Stratford-upon-Avon, 1919), pp. 144-45.

tion: Wilkins' collaboration with Day in *The travels of the three English brothers*⁶ (in which William Rowley had also been concerned) and the dedication to *Humour out of breath* where Day speaks of the comedy as "a poore friendlesse childe . . . yet sufficiently featur'd too, *had it been all of one mans getting*" (my italics). Boyle interpreted the italicized phrase as Day's acknowledgment of assistance by another playwright, whom Boyle took to be Wilkins.⁷ Upon these grounds, which are but remotely, if at all, connected with the problem of the authorship of *Law tricks*, Boyle concluded that it "would not be surprising to find Wilkins in *Law tricks*,"⁸ and proceeded to assign certain parts to Wilkins on the basis of passages parallel to the dramatist's acknowledged and presumed work.

Boyle's view has been adopted by several critics and his division of the play has been but slightly modified.⁹ His ascription to Wilkins of I, ii; II; IV, i; and V, ii (part), is accepted by Sykes,¹⁰ who adds part of I, i. Mr. Golding rejects Sykes' ascription of I, i to Wilkins and shows that Day contributed "about thirty lines (pp. 31-2) to II, and was part-author of IV, i."¹¹

It will be useful at this point to note briefly some of the methods, the assumptions, and the omissions of the investigator of parallel passages in Elizabethan drama, with special reference to *Law tricks*.

(1) The investigator sets aside such matters as the texture of the verse,

⁶ Entered in the Stationers' Register, June 29, 1607 (Arber, *Transcript*, III, 354) and printed in the same year.

⁷ *New Shakespear Society Transactions*, Part II (1880-85), p. 325. He also points out that Day's name appears alone on the title-page of *Humour out of breath* as on that of *Law tricks*, implying that much importance should not be attached to this fact. But is it not more reasonable to argue that, since Day acknowledged some sort of indebtedness to another, whoever he may be, in the dedication of *Humour out of breath*, he would have done so in *Law tricks*, if he had had a collaborator?

⁸ For a repetition of this opinion see Sykes, p. 79.

⁹ Surprisingly enough, Fleay (*Biographical chronicle of the English drama* [London, 1891], I, 111) vouchsafes no opinion upon this matter.

¹⁰ P. 145. Five years later Sykes (*Sidelights on Elizabethan drama* [Oxford, 1924], p. 223) repeated this view in a brief summary of the division of authorship in *Law tricks*.

¹¹ "Day and Wilkins as collaborators," *N&Q*, CL (1926), 417. I have made use of an unpublished Cornell dissertation on George Wilkins (1925), by Guy Shepard Greene, who assigns to that dramatist as "the sole or the collaborating author" a part in every scene of *Law tricks* with the exception of IV, ii. In his preface Mr. Greene writes, "Of Wilkins' partnership in *Law-tricks* and in *Humour out of breath*, especially in the latter, I am inclined to be doubtful, in spite of numerous resemblances to his style."

characterization, tone, etc., but uses as proof of authorship grammatical and rhetorical devices that are proverbial phrases and common Elizabethan modes of expression. These are worthless. Instances of this method as applied to Wilkins are cited below. (2) The investigator often neglects to take into account the influence of a possible source. In this instance, he ignores the influence of the anonymous play *How a man may choose a good wife from a bad* (1602)¹² on the phraseology of *Law tricks*. Several expressions assigned to Wilkins occur in the former play; these could have been introduced by Day without the intervention of a collaborator. (3) The investigator operates on the assumption that an author's right to a drama or to a part of it is vindicated if repetitions can be found. Expressing the converse of this principle, Sykes declares, "Day rarely repeats a phrase or allusion."¹³ On what grounds, then, does he assign a passage that is not repeated in Day to Wilkins even though it, or something that resembles it, is found in the latter's work? As a matter of fact, Day again and again employed words, phrases, and rhetorical and dramatic devices which Sykes overlooked and which warrant the reassignment of the authorship of *Law tricks* to Day.

In this attempt to reinstate Day as sole author I have pursued a method similar to that of the investigators of parallel passages, and it is no doubt open to some of the criticisms I have advanced; yet no other method is available by which to refute their argument. A page-by-page examination of the scenes attributed to Wilkins will, I trust, demonstrate the lack of foundation for their conclusions. As specimens of Day's work, I use *The isle of gulls* and the prose tract, *Peregrinatio scholastica*, his authorship of which has never been questioned, and those parts of *The blind beggar of Bednal Green*, *The travels of the three English brothers*, *Law tricks*, *Humour out of breath*, and *The parliament of bees* which have been unanimously allotted to him.

¹² The probable source of the episodes in *Law tricks* concerned with Lurdo, the countess, and Horatio is Barnabe Riche's translation in his *Farewell to militarie profession* (1581) of a story from Cinthio's *Hecatommithi*, Book III, novel 5. Upon Riche's version is also based *How a man may choose*, attributed to Thomas Heywood; see A. E. H. Swain's introduction to his edition in Bang's *Materialien*, XXXV (1912), vi-xiii, and A. M. Clark, *Thomas Heywood: playwright and miscellanist* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1931), p. 22. For a discussion of the play see C. R. Baskerville, "Sources and analogues of *How a man may choose a good wife from a bad*," *PMLA*, XXIV (1909), 711-30.

¹³ *Sidelights on Elizabethan drama*, p. 17.

ACT I, SCENE I

It has been noted that Sykes ascribes I, i, to the joint authorship of Wilkins and Day; but, unfortunately, he does not present evidence in support of this opinion. As Mr. Golding has reassigned I, i, wholly to Day, it would be a work of supererogation to review the scene in detail. However, certain devices are regarded as characteristic of Wilkins' style by his advocates, and it will be well to dispose of them now by showing their frequent occurrence in Day. These criteria, which have been used by Sykes¹⁴ in differentiating Wilkins from Shakespeare, but which are utterly inadequate to distinguish Wilkins from Day, are the repetition of a word within the line,¹⁵ verbal antitheses (e.g., "old . . . new"),¹⁶ the ellipsis of the nominative relative pronoun (of which there is but one instance in the disputed portion of *Law tricks*),¹⁷ and the use of the same rhyme-words.¹⁸ Each of these stylistic traits, as the footnotes testify, is sufficiently and sometimes abundantly duplicated in Day's authentic work. Other touchstones, such as triplets,¹⁹ Latin tags,²⁰ the use of the pronoun "I" as a rhyme-word,²¹ and a decasyllabic line ending in a dissyllabic -tion²² have been considered indicative of Wilkins' collaboration.

Parallels in *The miseries* to the first scene of *Law tricks* have been pointed out²³ and may be dealt with briefly: "rose,"²⁴ as applied to a

¹⁴ *Sidelights on Shakespeare*, pp. 150, 155, 156.

¹⁵ Cf. *The isle*, p. 22, l. 21; p. 23, l. 27; p. 31, l. 26; p. 32, l. 19; p. 48, l. 20; p. 49, l. 18; p. 62, l. 6; p. 66, l. 16; p. 90, l. 12; p. 109, l. 19; *Humour*, p. 8, ll. 1, 18, 20; p. 9, ll. 5, 28, 30; p. 12, ll. 8, 11; p. 28, ll. 1, 3, 5, 7, 17; etc. Each line is counted separately, excluding stage directions and speech prefixes.

¹⁶ Cf. *The isle*, p. 12, l. 9; p. 13, l. 11; p. 14, l. 9; p. 17, ll. 1-2, 3; p. 29, l. 14; p. 30, l. 22; p. 38, ll. 4, 28; p. 45, l. 29; p. 60, l. 12; p. 72, l. 10; p. 95, ll. 2, 14, etc.

¹⁷ Act II, p. 29, l. 27; cf. *The isle*, p. 49, l. 13.

¹⁸ Cf. "breath—death," *The isle*, pp. 34, 91; *Humour*, pp. 29, 77; "truth—youth," *The isle*, p. 48; *Humour*, p. 31; "be—me," *The isle*, p. 57; *Humour*, p. 10; "streame—teamē," *The isle*, p. 94; *Humour*, p. 55; "wars—stars," *The isle*, p. 94; *Humour*, pp. 6, 77; "kisse—this," *The isle*, pp. 43, 45 (twice); "Joue—loue," *Humour*, pp. 11, 17, 54, and many others.

¹⁹ Cf. *The isle*, p. 13, l. 23; p. 35, l. 20; p. 44, l. 2; p. 91, l. 15.

²⁰ Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 18, 24, 41, 72, 76, 81, 103; *Humour*, pp. 6, 26, 27, 69; the *Peregrinatio scholastica* is dotted with Latin phrases.

²¹ Cf. *Law tricks*, III, 1, pp. 38, 46; *The parliament*, Character 6, p. 41, ll. 4-6.

²² Cf. *The isle*, pp. 44, 48, 55, 62, 95; *Humour*, IV, 1, p. 54; *The travels*, scene iii, p. 29; *Law tricks*, IV, ll. p. 65; *The parliament*, Character 1, p. 11.

²³ The collection of words and phrases is derived from Mr. Greene's unpublished Cornell dissertation on George Wilkins.

²⁴ Cf. *Law tricks*, III, ll. p. 48: "rose-bud"; p. 49: "thy Aprill bewty, like a Rose."

lady, "knot of wedlock,"²⁵ "heaps my fame,"²⁶ "Zany,"²⁷ "curbs,"²⁸ and "sullied."²⁹ The expressions "knot of wedlock," "Zany," and "curbs," none of which is uniquely Wilkins', need not necessarily have been derived from his work, and the first was possibly suggested by *How a man may choose*.

Attention may be called here to a few striking parallels in the opening scene to Day's work elsewhere. Horatio's eulogy of "divine invention,"³⁰ opening the play, is comparable to Demetrius' speech on the same subject beginning Act III of *The isle*, pages 62-63. Horatio's hyperbolical words (p. 5):

Were my braine
Fordg'd out of vulgar metall without fier
And sprightly motion, my big-swole hopes
Had bene still-borne,

are echoed in another passage in *The isle*, page 71:

DEM. . . . the mettle I must forge my plot on lies a warming in the furnace of my braine, and I must fashion it Instantly for feare it burst [with] the heat.

The vivid image on page 10 of *Law tricks*:

And with blunt rowled Iestes spur-gall his side
Till his soule bleede,

is reminiscent of one in *The parliament*, Character 5, pages 34-35:

Tho this, and such gaid jades
Were spurre-gald-hackneyes, kick at their betters.³¹

²⁵ Cf. *How a man may choose*, ed. Swaen, Bang's *Materialien*, XXXV (1912), I. 2701; see also ll. 495-96. Cf. *Humour*, p. 53: "ere yee tie The gordian knot."

²⁶ *The isle*, p. 19: "the preferments your Lord hath heapt upon you."

²⁷ Cf. *Love's labour's lost*, V, ii, 463 (the Globe ed. is used in the references to Shakespeare); Middleton, *Blurt, Master Constable* (*Works*, ed. Bullen, Vol. I), II, ii, p. 44 (stage direction), III, i, 175; Jonson, *Volpone* (*Works*, ed. Gifford and Cunningham, Vol. III), II, i, p. 204; III, i, p. 226.

²⁸ Cf. Marlowe, *Edward II* (*Works*, ed. Brooke [Oxford, 1910]), I. 2002; Kyd, *Cornelia* (*Works*, ed. Boas [Oxford, 1901]), I, i, 58; IV, i, 173.

²⁹ Cf. *Peregrinatio*, p. 53: "sullied"; p. 61: "sulley."

³⁰ In Horatio's speech occurs the word "Cintheas" which appears in *The miseries* (Dodley's *Old English plays*, ed. Hazlitt, IX, 475). It is also found in *Humour*, III, ii, pp. 41, 42 (twice).

³¹ Character 5 has been assigned to Dekker, but the quotation does not appear in the corresponding part of *The noble soldier*.

ACT I, SCENE II

The resemblance of two passages in this scene, and of a third in the second act, to portions of *The miseries* and of *Pericles* probably induced Boyle to suggest Wilkins as co-author of *Law tricks*. These passages are the main supports of Boyle's hypothesis and the crux of the problem of Wilkins' collaboration.

The scene in *Law tricks* opens with a quibble which appears in slightly altered form in *The miseries*.

1. *Law tricks*, page 15:

Ioc. faith tell me, how doe you feele your selfe since you came ashore?

EM. Feele my selfe? Why, with my hands: What an idle question's that!

The miseries,³² page 532:

BAR. And how dost feel thyself, Frank, now thy father is dead?

ILF. As I did before, with my hands; how should I feel myself else?

In *Law tricks* this piece of literal misunderstanding is immediately followed by a jest which reappears exactly in *Pericles* and occurs somewhat modified in *The miseries*, in the prose romance *The painful adventures of Pericles* by Wilkins, and in *The travels*.

2. *Law tricks*, page 15:

Ioc. But, Madam, doe you remember what a multitude of fishes we saw at Sea? and I doe wonder how they can all live by one another.

EM. Why, foole, as men do on the Land: the great ones eate vp the little ones.

Pericles, II, i, 29-32:

THIRD FISHERMAN. Master, I marvel how fishes live in the sea.

FIRST FISHERMAN. Why, as men do a-land; the great ones eat up the little ones.

The miseries, page 539:

These men, like fish, do swim within one stream,
Yet they'd eat one another.

The painful adventures,³³ page 27:

. . . . the fishes live in the sea, as the powerfull on shoare, the great ones eate vp the little ones.

³² The quotations are from Hazlitt's edition of *Dodsley's Old English plays*, Vol. IX.

³³ Ed. Tycho Mommsen (Oldenburg, 1857).

The travels, scene vi, page 41:

SIR THO. . . . think that the Seas
Play'd with vs but as great men do a land.²⁴

The two quotations from *Law tricks*, comprising in all nine lines, constitute the whole of the evidence adduced by Boyle for Wilkins' hand in this scene. The temerity of the ascription does not need comment. The third passage, which is in the second act of *Law tricks*, is paralleled in *Pericles*. In the former the question is preceded by a device characteristic of Day's style—namely, the laconic query, "Your reason, Adam?" To this interrogation Adam, speaking of lawyers, says:

3. *Law tricks*, page 26:

I knew one of that facultie in one terme eate vp a hole Towne, Church, Steeple and all.

IUL. I wonder the Bels rung not all in his belly.

ADAM. No, sir; he sold them to buy his wife a Taffety Gowne, and himselfe a Velvet Iacket.

Pericles, II, i, 31-47:

FIRST FISHERMAN. Why, as men do a-land; the great ones eat up the little ones: I can compare our rich misers to nothing so fitly as to a whale;²⁵ . . . such whales have I heard on o' the land, who never leave gaping till they've swallowed the whole parish, church, steeple, bells, and all

THIRD FISHERMAN. But, master, if I had been the sexton, I would have been that day in the belfry.

SECOND FISHERMAN. Why, man?

²⁴ With these passages cf. the following: (1) *Pride of life* (*The non-cycle miracle plays*, ed. O. Waterhouse, EETS, Ex. Ser. [1909]), ll. 361-62: "pai farit as fiscis in a pol/be gret eteit be smal"; (2) *The castell of perseveraunce* (*The Macro plays*, ed. F. J. Furnivall and A. W. Pollard, EETS, Ex. Ser. [1904]), l. 2821: "be grete fyschys ete be smale"; (3) *The pedlars prophecie* ("Tudor Facsimile Texts," ed. J. S. Farmer, 1911), sig. Ev: "For all young Frye in the sea they [i.e., Pykes] would eate"; (4) Dekker, *If it be not a good play* (*Dramatic works*, Pearson's reprint, III, 268): "But sholes of Sharkee eate vp the Fish at Sea"; (5) W. Fennor, *The counter's commonwealth* (*The Elizabethan underworld*, ed. A. V. Judges [New York, 1930], p. 465): "In the sea the great ones eat up the little ones." See also Chettle, *Hoffman* (written 1602; printed 1631), sig. B^v, and *The valiant Scot* (1637), sig. F^v. The saying occurs in the French; see P. M. Quillard, *Dictionnaire des proverbes* (Paris, 1842), p. 604; Le Roux de Lincy, *Le livre des proverbes français* (Paris, 1859), I, 194; J. Huizinga, *The waning of the Middle Ages* (London, 1927), p. 210.

²⁵ Cf. Churchyard, *Chippes* (1575; *English poetical miscellanies*, ed. Collier [London, 1867], p. 145): "The whales, you see, eates up the little fishe," quoted in G. L. Apperson, *English proverbs and proverbial phrases* (London, 1929), p. 271 (s.v. "Great fish").

THIRD FISHERMAN. Because he should have swallowed me too: and when I had been in his belly, I would have kept such a jangling of the bells, that he should never have left, till he cast bells, steeple, church, and parish, up again.²⁷

Of these passages in *Law tricks*, (1) resembles *The miseries*; (2) and (3) *Pericles* only. In *Pericles*, (2) and (3) are contiguous; whereas in *Law tricks* there is an interval of several pages between them.²⁸ In the latter, (1) and (2) are contiguous. It is impossible, obviously, to determine from a study of the position of the quotations in their contexts or from a comparison of the forms of (3), extended in *Pericles* and reduced in *Law tricks*, what play or plays were the sources of the jests. If, as E. K. Chambers thinks, *Law tricks* was performed in 1604,²⁹ a date I do not accept, it may well be the source of the jests in the other two plays. On the other hand, if the drama was presented early in 1608, as I believe, it would not be surprising (to use Boyle's phrase) to find Day filching some jests from earlier comedies.³⁰ I have not succeeded in tracing (1) elsewhere; (2) was a proverbial saying, and (3) may have been a common oral jest of the time. The jests were probably regarded as common property, as are vaudeville and other jokes in our own day. Plagiarism in these matters is venial. It is possible that Wilkins (or Shakespeare, if he wrote the jests in *Pericles*) influenced *Law tricks*, but influence is not authorship. The context of the jests shows that we are dealing with different writers. The buoyancy and the careless gaiety of *Law tricks* are lacking in *The miseries* and in *Pericles*.

²⁷ Cf. *The isle*, p. 67, ll. 13-17. In an unfinished form this jest appears in *The trial of treasure* (1567; *Dodsley's Old English plays*, ed. Hazlitt, III, 273): "GREEDY-GUT. Eat up, at a mouthful, houses and lands"; also the following page. See also Thomas Wilson, *A discourse upon usury* (1572), ed. R. H. Tawney (London, 1925), p. 286. See also the following jingle from Halliwell-Phillipps, *The nursery rhymes of England* (London [1853]), p. 33:

"Robin the Bobbin, the big-bellied Ben,
He eat more meat than fourscore men;
He eat a cow, he eat a calf,
He eat a butcher and a half;
He eat a church, he eat a steeple,
He eat the priest and all the people! Etc."

²⁸ Boyle (*New Shakespear Society Transactions*, Part II [1880-85], p. 335) makes the mistake of thinking that (3) in *Law tricks* follows immediately upon (2). K. Delighton, in his Introduction to the Arden Shakespeare *Pericles* (1907), p. xvii, falls into the same error.

²⁹ *The Elizabethan stage*, III, 285.

³⁰ *The miseries* is dated 1607; see Chambers, III, 513. A performance of *Pericles* was given between January 5, 1606, and November 23, 1608 (Chambers, *William Shakespeare* [Oxford, 1930], I, 522).

We may now continue with the analysis of I, ii, proceeding page by page. The two jests on page 15 are followed by a third. Emilia declares that she is "great passing great," and her page, Joculo, answers that he will help to deliver her.

EM. Mans death of what?

LOC. Why, of your Maiden-head, Madam . . . ; or rather of the huge birth of knauerie y'are in trauell of.

EM. And in sooth, *Joculo*, at this time I stand in some need of a wittie Mid-wif.

In *The isle*, page 41, there is a passage which resembles the foregoing very closely:

BASIL. My thoughts come like a saile afore the wind, swolne big with newes; and thine eares, the midwife, must deliuer me of this burthen.⁴⁰

With the phrases "the huge birth of knauerie" and "this embrion of knauerie" (p. 16) compare the similar "a bait of knauerie" in *The isle*, page 82.

On page 16 the following brisk dialogue takes place:

LOC. Or rather to catch a quicke Eele by the—

EM. Teeth; as I haue done you, sir.

LOC. Nay, and you breake iestes a my teeth once, I haue done with you.

EM. If the breaking of the jest kept your teeth whole twas well broken.

In this passage the interweaving, the repetition, and the bandying about of a few words are characteristic of Day;⁴¹ specimens of this device are abundant in *The isle* and in *Humour*. Furthermore, the conception of "jestes" as physical objects is echoed in *The isle*, page 54: "Will you break your iestes against the barres of yon chamber windowe." A few lines below the jest in *Law tricks*, Emilia says, "I intend to dance a prettie change with my name." This idiomatic expression is contained in *Humour*, page 37: "My lady cannot choose but dance well, shees so full of prety changes."

On page 17 the encounter of Polymetes and Julio on the one hand, with Emilia and Joculo on the other, resembles very closely the meeting in *Humour*, page 24, of Aspero and his boy with Florimell and her page. There is the same sharp repartee, the same breathless speed of

⁴⁰ See also *The isle*, p. 78, ll. 13-14; cf. *Law tricks*, III, i, p. 41: "Ile be the Mid-wife and helpe to deliuer it." This figure is common in Elizabethan literature, as are many others which will be quoted here.

⁴¹ Cf. Sykes, *Sidelights on Elizabethan drama*, pp. 15-17.

question and answer, and not infrequently the same words. Much of the encounter in *Law tricks* is written in broken couplets,⁴² a favorite device with Day. One example of the broken couplet from *Law tricks*, page 18, will suffice to illustrate Day's usage:⁴³

IUL. God sauе, faire sweete!
 EM. Amen, —from such as you.
 IUL. You had said *for* such, had your tongue gone true.
 EM. Why then, belike, I lye.
 IUL. I would you did
 —Within my Curtens.
 EM. Marry, loue forbid.

To return to page 17: Joculo, wishing to open a conversation with the approaching courtiers, jostles Julio, who turns on the offender with the brief "Your reason, Sir?" The query and the situation in which it is uttered are characteristic of Day's method of introducing a jest.⁴⁴ The comparative infrequency of this device in Wilkins' work indicates the rashness of attributing I, ii, to him. The curious expression "To make thee . . . with the Souldier to fall off [=retire, withdraw],"⁴⁵ repeated in IV, i, page 59, occurs in *The isle*, page 64: "Will you fall off, Sir?" Parallels for the idioms "we are fallen into their eyes . . . we are shrew'd moats" are found in the *Peregrinatio*, page 58: "The next moate that fell into Alethes eye," and in *The isle*, page 92: "I had the boy in shrowd [i.e., shrewd] suspision."

On page 18 occurs the elaborate image, "In a weake Syrens Cob-web flatterie," to which *The isle*, page 19, furnishes a parallel: "such Court-spyders . . . weaue their webbes of flatterie."⁴⁶ There is also the tossing to and fro of a word ("love") previously mentioned as characteristic of Day. When Julio has been brought to a halt by Emilia's

⁴² A broken couplet is a couplet in which one line or preferably both lines are divided among two or more speakers. Only six widely separated examples of the broken couplet occur in *The miseries*, pp. 526-27; p. 544, ll. 20-22; p. 545, ll. 10-12; p. 557, ll. 25-27; p. 558, ll. 14-16; p. 575, ll. 11-13.

⁴³ Other instances of this device in Day are: *The isle*, pp. 55-58, 95-97; *Humour*, pp. 32, 42-43, 54, 55; *Law tricks*, I, I, p. 6; III, I, pp. 45-46; III, II, pp. 47, 49-50; V, I, p. 72.

⁴⁴ Other examples of this device are: *The isle*, p. 25, I. 20; p. 26, II. 7, 15, 19, 25; p. 46, I. 22; p. 47, II. 3, 7; p. 63, II. 15, 26; p. 64, II. 13, 15, 19; p. 66, I. 26; p. 70, I. 24; *Humour*, p. 6, II. 6, 15; p. 7, I. 22; p. 13, I. 27; p. 22, II. 4, 25; p. 23, I. 4; p. 45, I. 22; p. 46, I. 23; *Law tricks*, I, I, p. 7, I. 17; IV, I, p. 55, I. 27.

⁴⁵ *NED*, s.v. "Fall," 91b; *Henry VIII*, IV, I, 64, is quoted.

⁴⁶ *The isle*, p. 32: "the web of my hopes," and p. 62: "weaue A quainter webbe Suspition to deceaue."

caustic remark, Polymetes turns to him, exclaiming, "What! graueld, *Julio*," and engages in an "ayrie warre" consisting of a series of trifling exchanges with his female opponent, both punning on the expressions "foole," "board," and "a shot in jest." In *Humour*, page 34, the page reproaches Florimell for her feeble reply to Aspero, "What! aground," and then the two wit-adversaries bandy about the word "fool."⁴⁷ At an earlier encounter (pp. 24-25) with Florimell, Aspero and his boy use the words "board" and "shot of flattery."

In *Law tricks*, page 19, Joculo warns Polymetes to be alert; otherwise Emilia "will keepe her pace and leaue you in the mire." This idea and its verbal expression recur in *Humour*, page 18:

Fr. O shallow wit, at the bottome so soone.

Flo. Deepe ynough to lay you in the mire.⁴⁸

The implied antithesis in "A womans feature, but a Schollers tongue" is a trait of Day's style, and Polymetes' stepping out of character to comment on another personage, and thus impeding the action, is an instance of an Elizabethan convention of frequent occurrence in Day's works.⁴⁹ Polymetes' remarks on learning are not unlike Florimell's disquisition⁵⁰ on this subject in *Humour*, pages 6 and 7.

Another example of the broken couplet occurs on page 20, and there is also a type of figure occasionally found in Day—the humorous combination of a concrete and an abstract word. The phrase, "cast off the furd-gowne of hate and speake out of the naked Doublet and hose of judgement," resembles in conception (obviously not in language) the following passage from *The isle*, page 60: "clip off the taile of thy discourse with the scissors of attention."⁵¹

In view of the resemblances and parallels in I, ii, to Day's acknowledged work, it is absolutely unnecessary to assume the assistance of a collaborator.

⁴⁷ Cf. *Humour*, p. 18.

⁴⁸ Cf. *Love's labour's lost*, II, i, 120:

"BEROWNE. Your wit's too hot, it speeds too fast, 'twill tire.
KATHERINE. Not till it leave the rider in the mire."

⁴⁹ Cf. *The isle*, pp. 10-11, 13, 15, 19-20, etc.

⁵⁰ Cf. *Law tricks*, I, i, pp. 9-10, containing Polymetes' discourse on contemplation.

⁵¹ For other examples see *The isle*, p. 11, l. 27—p. 12, l. 1; p. 22, l. 11; p. 70, ll. 27-28; p. 106, ll. 6-7.

ACT II

The second act has been assigned wholly to Wilkins by every investigator except Mr. Golding, who suggests that pages 31-32 should be ascribed to Day.⁵² I shall try to show that the whole act belongs to Day.

The act opens (p. 21) with the bandying-about of the word "prodigal," once in the form of the brief question ("How prodigall?") so much affected by Day.⁵³ The word "vpright" suggests to the punning temper of Day the word "straight," as the noun "ordinaries" calls to his mind the adjective "ordinarie."

On page 22 Lurdo, taken aback by Adam's description of tobacco as a "Puncke," says that Adam "nick-names a stranger herb," where "stranger"⁵⁴ is used as an adjective of the positive degree meaning "foreign" or "alien." This curious usage is repeated in *The isle*, page 99:

To win my loue lend me some stranger shape,
Such as yourselves haue worne. . . .

Adam refers to "this Chimney-sweeper, Tobacco," a metaphor which is explained in the *Peregrinatio*, page 71: "findeing the dore open and the chimny puffing and smoakeing as he [i.e., the chimney] had bene takeinge Tobacko."

A series of short sentences uttered in rapid succession, such as is employed by Lurdo on page 23: "They did not? take me with you: what's the cause?" is frequently found in *The isle*,⁵⁵ where utterances of this kind are usually assigned to Dametas, a character of much the same type as Lurdo. Dametas' continual repetition of the catchword "policy" is the antitype of Lurdo's predilection for such phrases as "law-tricks," "conceit," and "law." These two, endowed with the same air of mock-villainous plotting, are self-important gulls priding

⁵² Mr. Golding (*N & Q*, CL[1926], 417) has, by rearranging a line, revealed a broken couplet (called by an oversight "blank-verse lines"). This couplet is followed by another of the same kind. Mr. Golding also suggests that Day may have revised the remainder of the scene (pp. 32-35).

⁵³ Cf. the whole passage with *Humour*, p. 5:

"Hauing banisht war, which like a prodigall
Kept wastfull reuels with our subiects bloud."

See also *The isle*, pp. 35-36.

⁵⁴ Day uses the comparative "more straunger" in *Humour*, p. 61, l. 26. See *NED*, s.v. "Stranger," 13b.

⁵⁵ *The isle*, pp. 15, 16 (thrice), 17, 18, 21, 24, 25, 28, 30, 31, 37, 74, 101.

themselves upon their fancied shrewdness. Both are avowed despisers of poetry and bend all their efforts to the acquisition of wealth. They are blood brothers: satiric delineations of the sin of covetousness. Boyle thought that the numerous references to law pointed to Wilkins as the author of this act. There is evidence to show that Day himself could make sardonic observations concerning lawyers.⁵⁶ There is also a repetition of the phrase "spur-gald Iade" on this page.

On page 24 there are two instances of the broken couplet and on the following page three more. The word "wormal-wood" and the phrase "my pen dipt in the iuice of gall" (p. 25) are used by Day elsewhere.⁵⁷ Emilia, when reproving Polymetes for his satiric verses on women, refers to his "stammering Iambick vaine," a phrase which is reminiscent of "abuse let blood in the maister vaine" in *The isle*, page 5.⁵⁸

By the rearrangement of a few lines on page 25⁵⁹ it is possible to make a broken couplet:

POLY. Suppose some doe?	
EM.	Each one in this agrees
To scandall vs.	
LU.	—And talke of Lawyers fees.

The jest concerning the swallowing of the parish on page 26 has already been discussed. Preceding the jest are found the bandying-about of several words and the question "Your reason, Adam?" When Adam finishes his jesting remark, Polymetes makes the comment, "What a prow'd Iacke was that?" The word "jack" turns up in *The isle* and in the *Peregrinatio*.⁶⁰ The phrase "sit on the skirts of"

⁵⁶ *The isle*, p. 16: "you regard mee no more then a carelesse Lawyer doth an undone cyant"; p. 19, ll. 13-14; also p. 65, ll. 4, 5, 7; p. 71, ll. 1-2. Boyle overlooked the fact that, though Lurdo speaks about the law, he is essentially an ignoble, avaricious courtier of the same type as Dametas in *The isle*. When Lurdo bargains concerning a loan, Emilia exclaims contemptuously (p. 28), "Lords turne Vsurers." See also *Law tricks*, I, i, p. 11; *Humour*, IV, iii, p. 57.

⁵⁷ See the dedication of *Law tricks* for similar phrases; cf. *The isle*, p. 5: "and there be not Wormewood water and Copperes int He not like it"; *Peregrinatio*, p. 63: "bitter as worme wood."

⁵⁸ *The parliament*, Character 5, p. 38: "to hit the Mr. Vaine Of Poesie."

⁵⁹ The phrase, "Of all land Beasts," is apparently modeled on the expression "Of all Land-monsters," in I, i, p. 11 (generally assigned to Day).

⁶⁰ *The isle*, p. 92; *Humour*, pp. 62, 68; *Peregrinatio*, p. 45. "Jack" is a common term of derogation in Elizabethan drama.

assigned by Boyle to Wilkins occurs in *The blind beggar of Bednal Green*⁶¹ and in the *Peregrinatio*, page 71.

Emilia's observation concerning lawyers on page 27 bears a close resemblance to others in Day. This is followed by a quibble on the words "iest" and "earnest," which occurs several times in *The isle*.⁶² Boyle points out that *The miseries*, page 496, provides a parallel to the word "affinity," but he did not observe that this word is repeated three times in as many lines in a manner characteristic of Day.

Boyle draws two parallels between *The miseries* and a passage in *Law tricks* on page 28,⁶³ referring to Lurdo's demand for "security," upon which Emilia exclaims:

A Lawyer right!

POLY. Securitie! Leases and old rents, Castles and Townships, able men, good securitie: Townes are no Starters,⁶⁴ theile hold out winde and weather.

Lu. I crave no more: let me have pawnes and vse.

The notion that a "lawyer" should never lend money without security is found in *The isle*, page 65: "I learned of my Lord to lende nothing without securitie and pawnes."

Broken couplets appear on page 29 and to a greater extent on the following page. Lurdo describes the arbor provided for Emilia's habitation as follows:

And Arbors with sweete violet Beds,
That haue bin prest to death with maiden-heads.

This passage is closely paralleled, though more delicately phrased, in *The isle*, page 43:

DUTCHES. This way he went; on this sweet violet bed
Still dwells the print of his enamoured tread:
The dearest flowers haue strengthened their sweete

The intended contrast in the line

There's a Cloud rising drives my Sun away,

⁶¹ I, iii, p. 22 (a scene generally assigned to Chettle). The use of the expression in the *Peregrinatio* justifies its attribution to Day in *Law tricks*.

⁶² P. 58, l. 24; p. 65, l. 12; p. 66, l. 9; see also *Humour*, p. 16, ll. 17-19; p. 35, ll. 1-2; p. 49, ll. 6-7, 111-2; p. 52, ll. 6-7.

⁶³ The mixture of blank verse and rhyme on pp. 28 and 29 should be compared with *The isle*, pp. 34, 37-39, 43-44, 45, 78, 95.

⁶⁴ Cf. *The isle*, p. 73: "acquaint me with the older Foxes starting hole"; p. 97: "that very word hath started her"

is concisely reproduced in the phrase "the sun in a clowde" in *The isle*, page 50.⁶⁵

Page 30 contains broken couplets, as has been mentioned, and the expression "Law-trickes."⁶⁶ The use of the short sentences on the page should also be noted as characteristic of Day.⁶⁷

Pages 31 and 32 have been shown by Mr. Golding to belong to Day. A few items may be added in support of his opinion. There is a broken couplet on page 31. For the phrase "Your eyes [are] t[w]oo Dya-monds" I suggest, in addition to Mr. Golding's parallels, the following from *Humour*, page 9: "If her bright eye dim not the Diamond." The lines following the phrase quoted from *Law tricks* are strikingly similar in conception to a passage in the MS *Parliament*.⁶⁸ At the bottom of page 32 the word "credit"⁶⁹ is repeated four times and on the following page a fifth time.

Several broken couplets on page 33 indicate Day's workmanship. The use of the word "cleane" as an adverb meaning 'completely,' 'entirely,' often found in Elizabethan drama, occurs several times in Day.⁷⁰ Boyle finds a parallel in *The miseries*, page 534, to the compound "Stock-fish,"⁷¹ a contemptuous epithet of common occurrence in the writings of the time. Almost absolute proof that Day wrote the final portion of Act II is the introduction of a page. Certainly, nothing is more characteristic of Day and less of Wilkins than the boy or page inserted, so to speak, into a scene, to keep jests on tap or to egg

⁶⁵ Cf. also *The isle*, p. 53, ll. 15-17; p. 95: "Your sunnes eclipsit, you dote vpon a cloude"; *Humour*, p. 31, ll. 22-23.

⁶⁶ I have encountered this phrase outside of the play only in *The parliament*, Character 2, p. 22. "Love-tricks" occurs in Marston's *Parasitaster* (1606; *Works*, ed. Bullen, II, 415); cf. Shirley's play named *Love tricks*.

⁶⁷ Boyle points out that the phrase "non ultra writ" appears in *The travels*, scene viii, p. 50 (usually assigned to Wilkins), as "we write Non ultra." If *Law tricks* was written after this play, it is possible that Day borrowed the expression from Wilkins.

⁶⁸ Character 6, p. 41, n. 1:

"Theres a mild Majestie throand in his browes
at ech haire on his head a Cupid growes
whose little fingers (curling Golden wyer)
make amorous netts to Intangle chaste desir."

⁶⁹ *The isle*, pp. 30, 63, 66, 67, 104; *Peregrinatio*, dedication, p. 38; *Law tricks*, I, i, pp. 7, 14; III, i, pp. 35, 46. Lines 13-16 on p. 32 can be arranged as a broken couplet.

⁷⁰ *The isle*, pp. 18, 50, 74; *Humour*, p. 49; *Law tricke*, IV, ii, p. 63.

⁷¹ There is only one example of this word in Day; on the other hand, there is but one instance of it in Wilkins' acknowledged work. The word was probably suggested by *How a man may choose*, ed. Swaen, Bang's *Materialien*, I, 1071. Cf. *1 Henry IV*, II, iv, 271: "Away . . . you stock-fish."

someone on. As the boy in *Humour* engineers a clever stratagem for his master Aspero, so in *Law tricks* the page finds shelter for the countess and by his trembling audacities brings about the resolution of the plot.

All the brief questions on page 34 asked of the boy by the countess are in Day's manner. The expression "he . . . puts chastetie to the quick" is paralleled in *The parliament*, page 7:

Ile send out Waspes shall sting
Their Malice to the quick.

The phrase "straine curtesie" is duplicated in *The isle*, page 66.

ACT IV, SCENE I

The first scene of Act IV has also been assigned to Wilkins by Boyle and Sykes, while Mr. Golding has endeavored to show that Day collaborated with Wilkins in it. The evidence indicates that Day was the sole author of this scene.

The idiomatic expression on page 51, "what thou dost is not vnder a colour," is analogous to "I ha no colour fort" in *The isle* (p. 42). Emilia's expression, "I shall sit vpon your skirts" has already been noticed. Sykes⁷² has called attention to a proverbial saying on page 52: "Fare fech'd and deere bought⁷³ is good for . . . Ladyes," which appears in the pseudo-Shakespearian *Yorkshire tragedy* (1608), a play which Sykes attributes to Wilkins.

On page 53 occurs the word "Dottrell" used as a term of derogation, which reappears in the *Peregrinatio*, page 44. The repetition of the word "braine" is characteristic of Day, as is that of the word "Lady" on the preceding page. Mr. Golding has pointed out that Polymetes' mistake in supposing the "seauen blacke deadly sinnes" to be the "seauen liberall sciences" (p. 54) is the same as the mistake of Philosophos in *Peregrinatio*, page 52. Mr. Golding also observes that the word "notable" on page 55 occurs four times in *The isle*,⁷⁴ and that "Court spaniell" appears three times in this play.⁷⁵ The brief form of

⁷² *Sidelights on Shakespeare*, pp. 85-86.

⁷³ A play with this title was entered in the Stationers' Register, 1566-67 (Arber, *Transcript*, I, 331). See also Marston and Webster, *The malcontent* (1600; *Works*, ed. Bullen, Vol. I), V, ii, 261, and *The birth of Merlin* (printed 1662; *The Shakespeare apocrypha*, ed. Brooke [Oxford, 1918]), III, iv, 117-18. For many other examples see Apperson, p. 203.

⁷⁴ *The isle*, pp. 35, 67, 80, 81; cf. *Humour*, p. 26.

⁷⁵ *The isle*, pp. 24 (twice), 25; cf. *Humour*, p. 63.

the question "Your reason?" at the foot of page 55 points to Day's authorship. Horatio's condemnatory remarks on the "rascal" multitude (pp. 55-56) are similar to those of Aspero in *Humour*, page 71. The word "cable" in the line "Nor wreath my body like a Cable Hat-band," occurs in *The parliament*, Character 8, page 54: "large cables Of pearle & gold." The broken couplets and the broken blank verse lines⁷⁶ on page 56 are indicative of Day's hand.

Polymetes, at the suggestion of his advisers, decides to dismiss Emilia (p. 58): "I must be round with you, Tris; you must pack." The expressions "round" and "pack" are used in *The isle*.⁷⁷ Mr. Golding calls attention to Day's use of the phrase⁷⁸ (p. 59) "Rosa solis or Aqua mirabilis" in *The isle*, page 41. Such features as the verse line ending in a dissyllabic *-tion* (p. 56), the triplet (p. 57), and the Latin phrase (p. 60) may be ascribed as appropriately to Day as to another.⁷⁹

ACT IV, SCENE III

The short third scene of Act IV, not mentioned by previous critics, who presumably regarded it as part of IV, ii, may be dealt with briefly. The scene opens with some reflections on certain varieties of mankind by Horatio (p. 67):

His rich inuention, Machiuilian plots—
Idle, illusiuie, antick phantasies.

"Machiavellian" appears twice in *Humour*, pages 14 and 21, and the phrase "illusive tenant,"⁸⁰ applied to the disguised Demetrius, occurs in *The isle*, page 28. In *The isle* there are few expressions as frequently used as "invention."⁸¹ The adjective "smooth" on page 68 in the sense of 'sly,' 'crafty,' is also a favorite with Day.⁸²

⁷⁶ Cf. *The isle*, p. 97; *Humour*, pp. 12-13, 53-54; *Law tricks*, I, i, p. 13; III, i, p. 30; III, ii, p. 50.

⁷⁷ *The isle*, p. 29: "To be round"; p. 93: "tel em roundly." "Pack" is used twice as a verb: the imperative "pack" on p. 16; "he packes vs off with 50 crownes," on p. 80.

⁷⁸ The idiomatic expression "fall off" on p. 59 has been discussed above.

⁷⁹ Mr. Golding, seeking a parallel to "the old Foxe" (p. 60), suggests the phrase "Ware an olde Fox," also in *Law tricks*, p. 77. The expression occurs twice on p. 73 in *The isle*.

⁸⁰ Cf. *Law tricks*, V, i, p. 73: "subtile opinion . . . Cuts out and shapes illusive fantasies."

⁸¹ *The isle*, pp. 12, 18, 39, 40, 41, 42 (twice), 46, 53, 62, 63, 104, 105.

⁸² *Ibid.*, pp. 9, 20, 42, 55, 57, 81.

ACT V, PAGES 86-91

Of Act V, Boyle, followed by Sykes and Mr. Golding, ascribed to Wilkins the section from page 86 to the end of the play.⁸³ Boyle depended upon the recurrence on page 86 of two allusions found in IV, i, pages 53-54, to establish his attribution. Such cross-references, when unsupported by other evidence, have no weight as proof. As it would be tedious to continue the enumeration of devices and phrases already discussed, and as the commonplace dialogue admits of little analysis, a few particulars only are noted.⁸⁴

The octosyllabic couplets on pages 87 and 88 are similar to those of Characters 11 and 12 in *The parliament*. On page 87 occurs the phrase "danceth changes." The repetition of the same rhyme-word in a couplet (p. 89) is a common practice of Day's.⁸⁵ The broken couplets on page 88 and on the following pages are in Day's manner. The last two lines of the play

Lastly, thy merrit is not trivial
That turned to mirth a Sceane so tragicall.

are reminiscent of a passage in *The isle*, page 81: "Twil be a rare sceane of myrth."⁸⁶

To conclude: There is no direct or indirect evidence of Wilkins' collaboration with Day in *Law tricks*. If Wilkins did contribute to this play, no trace of his contribution remains. No scene need be assigned to Wilkins on the ground of a pronounced dissimilarity to Day's acknowledged work or of a lack of phrases and literary devices characteristic of Day. Some passages were possibly written under the influence of Wilkins' work (if *Law tricks* was composed early in 1608), but these have been shown to be imbedded in work distinctively Day's. The evidence of Day's sole authorship of *Law tricks* is overwhelming.

COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY

⁸³ There is no division of this act in Bullen's edition.

⁸⁴ Cf. Joculo's "Then naile me to your lips with a kisse" (p. 85) with "Grieve nailes me to the ground" (II, p. 30). These passages have been attributed to Wilkins by reason of their similarity to a passage in the Calverley pamphlet, assigned to this writer. But Joculo continues with "make me currant palement," the word "currant" being distinctive of Day; cf. *The isle*, pp. 50, 92; *Law tricks*, III, i, pp. 35, 37, 43; IV, ii, p. 66. Cf. *Law tricks*, III, i, p. 43: "He naile him to a poast."

⁸⁵ Cf. *The isle*, pp. 44 (twice), 56-57, 97; *Humour*, pp. 8-9, 9 (thrice), 10 (thrice), 12, 28 (thrice), 29 (twice), 30 (thrice), 44 (twice), 70, 76 (twice).

⁸⁶ Cf. *The isle*, pp. 45, 100; *Humour*, p. 40: "I could make a notable sceane of mirth."

THOMAS BAKER, MRS. MANLEY, AND THE
FEMALE TATLER

WALTER GRAHAM

IT IS now generally recognized that the *Female Tatler* (July 8, 1709—March 31, 1710) was the chief early rival of Richard Steele's *Tatler*. This active competitor is known to have exerted some influence on Steele's methods, even upon the evolution of the periodical essay and upon the subject matter which engaged the attention of Steele and his great coadjutor. The authorship of the *Female Tatler*, or the identity of "Mrs. Crackenthorpe," is therefore a matter of some interest to students of the Queen Anne period.

Until recently the ascription of authorship to Thomas Baker, a minor dramatist of the period, has been unquestioned. His contemporaries seem to have regarded him as the author. In particular, the contemporary periodical, the *British Apollo*, attacked him by name in a feud with the *Female Tatler*. The *Hope catalogue* in the Bodleian Library may have been the source of information depended upon by later writers. In any event, Aitken, Lowndes, Drake, Marr, and J. G. Muddiman, in the *Times Handlist*, accepted Baker as the author. Only Fox Bourne seems to have doubted, and he for no ascertainable reason.

In 1931 Professor Paul Bunyan Anderson brought forward a case for Mrs. Mary de la Riviere Manley's authorship. His case was weakened, however, by the fact that he knew little about another *Female Tatler* which was issued between August 17 and October 17, 1709, for a total of twenty-six numbers.¹ Professor Anderson at that time believed only two numbers of this "spurious" periodical to be extant,

¹ "The history and authorship of Mrs. Crackenthorpe's *Female Tailer*," *MP*, XXVIII (1931), 354-60. Mr. R. T. Milford (*ibid.*, XXIX, 350) corrected Anderson's statement regarding the second or "spurious" *Female Tailer*. The twenty-six numbers are preserved in the Bodleian Library. Photostatic reproductions of both periodicals are now in the University of Illinois Library. See also Mr. Anderson's "Mistress Delariviere Manley's biography," *MP*, XXXIII (1936), 273; and his "Splendor out of scandal," *PQ*, XV (1936), 286-300, in which he points out a possible connection between the work of Mandeville and some of the contributions to the *Female Tailer*.

and was misled by a statement of "Mrs. Crackenthorpe" into thinking that the total number of issues was seventeen instead of twenty-six. Since the original *Female Tatler* (as it has been preserved) consists of Nos. 1-18 printed by B. Bragge, of Paternoster Row, and Nos. 19-111 printed by A. Baldwin, Professor Anderson assumed, as have all other students, that Nos. 19-111 constitute a continuation of the same periodical, or, it is better to say, the work of the same "author."² But an examination of the twenty-six later Bragge issues (19-44) only adds to the confusion—at any rate makes the authorship of the Baldwin issues a matter of less certainty—for the reader is constantly meeting with claims that the so-called "spurious" *Female Tatler*, which was published consistently by B. Bragge, in Paternoster Row, is the original and genuine periodical (see especially Nos. 22 and 23 of the B. Bragge series) and that the other, put out by A. Baldwin, from No. 19, is in reality the fraud. These claims are made more plausible by the notice which may be found in practically every number of the B. Bragge *Female Tatler*, after No. 19:

Mrs. Crackenthorpe desires all her friends to continue their correspondence, and direct for her as usual at Mr. Bragge's in Paternoster row, where the original and genuine paper is published, and where complete sets may be had from the beginning.

In this debate between the rival *Female Tatlers*, the advantage at this point seems to be with the paper published throughout by Bragge, which could furnish "complete sets from the beginning." The other "Mrs. Crackenthorpe" met this argument by declaring that she had been disingenuously treated by her first printer, and desired to leave him, then had been chagrined to find that "authors cannot even command their names and titles."

Now the question in the student's mind today is not whether B. Bragge's or A. Baldwin's *Female Tatler* is the "genuine," but whether Mrs. Manley or Thomas Baker had any connection with either of these periodicals—a difficult matter to prove beyond a doubt. Professor Anderson's ingenious case for Mrs. Manley appears upon examination

² I shall refer to this series as the Bragge-Baldwin *Female Tatler*. The other will be referred to as the Bragge *Female Tatler*, in order to distinguish it (Nos. 19-44). Mrs. Crackenthorpe's explanation of the change of printers did not prevent the author of the later numbers of Bragge's paper from stoutly maintaining that it was the original and genuine *Female Tatler*.

to be far from conclusive. It is hard to believe that he has presented anything more than a conjecture. His arguments are as follows:

1. The *Female Tatler* abandoned its pretense of authorship by "Mrs. Crackenthorpe" when Mrs. Manley was arrested, on October 29, 1709. But the change in format and style came on November 2. Numbers 50 and 51 appeared in the meantime, without any change in tone or appearance, while Mrs. Manley was in custody, confined without writing materials, as she later complained in the *Adventures of Rivella*.³

2. The second argument—that the feminism of "Mrs. Crackenthorpe" is like that of Mrs. Manley—destroys the first; since it cannot be shown that any marked changes in style or content occurred after the passing of "Mrs. Crackenthorpe" from the scene. The same "feminism" is found throughout the *Female Tatler* (cf. Nos. 11 and 87 especially), just as the attitude of the paper toward certain contemporaries like Thomas D'Urfey did not change. Baker seems to have been quite capable of assuming a feminism suited to his purpose, just as Steele often did in the *Tatler*.⁴ The *British Apollo* satirized Baker as one who frequently assumed female disguise;⁵ and his comedies indicate that he could express the woman's point of view sufficiently well.

3. "Mrs. Manley shows herself beneath the masque of 'Mrs. Crackenthorpe' in introducing material from the *New Atalantis*." It is hard to accept this statement when one examines the passages referred to. The poem on Mrs. Manley's *Charlotte; or the guardian* (*Female Tatler* Nos. 8 and 15) does not necessarily indicate that she had anything to do with it. The notoriety of her *New Atalantis* at this time was a sufficient reason for allusions to it, or paraphrases of parts of it. It is to be noted that the poem was ostensibly submitted to "Mrs. Crackenthorpe" by an Oxford student who professed to admire the story and sent it "in homage to your female empire." As a matter of fact, in a paper (No. 14) published between the two containing parts of *Charlotte; or the guardian* is a satirical reference to "Mrs. Manlove"—certainly meant to hit Mrs. Manley. She is named as authority for the very scandalous story related here, and characterized as one "who

³ (London, 1714), p. 114.

⁴ See the *Jenny Distaff* papers, Nos. 10, 33, 36, etc. These papers of Steele probably suggested the idea of a *Female Tatler*.

⁵ *British Apollo*, September 14, 1709.

generally searches into the bottom of such matters." It was not characteristic of Mrs. Manley thus to malign herself (see her *Adventures of Rivella* [1711]).

4. Mrs. Crackenthorpe alludes to her sister Micklethwait and her brother Copperthwaite, while Mrs. Manley had a sister Mary Braithwaite. It cannot be conceded that an argument from a similarity of surnames can ever be convincing. After all, Baker may have had a sister or a friend by the name of Micklethwait.

Such are the chief arguments in favor of Mrs. Manley's authorship of the *Female Tatler*. For each one of these an equally cogent argument may be adduced for denying her any possible part in it. The A. Baldwin *Female Tatler* and Defoe's *Review* were prosecuted by the grand jury in one presentment, and the *New Atalantis* in another.⁶ It seems inconceivable that Mrs. Manley should not have been suspected by her contemporaries if she had been indeed the author. Some of them, Swift or Steele especially, who knew her well, would surely have mentioned the fact, if she had been associated with the *Female Tatler*. Again, it seems likely that if Mrs. Manley had had such an instrument of vengeance in her hands in September 3, 1709, or later, she would have used it, instead of writing furiously to Steele, after the attack on herself in the *Tatler*, No. 63.⁷ As a matter of fact, no really virulent references to Bickerstaff appear in the *Female Tatler* until two months later (see Bragge-Baldwin series, Nos. 50, 74, 81, 86; and Bragge, *Female Tatler*, Nos. 31, 32, 41, 43). Probably the best-known allusion to the *Female Tatler* is Addison's "I have been scolded by a *Female Tatler*, and slandered by another of the same character, under the title of *Atalantis*" (*Tatler*, No. 229). Of the same character, certainly, were the *New Atalantis*, the *Female Tatler*, the *British Apollo*, and many other books and periodicals of the period; but it is useless to assert that Addison intended to connect the *Female Tatler* and Mrs. Manley. Finally, the fact that no pronounced Tory bias is apparent in either of the *Female Tatlers* makes it seem incredible that Mrs. Manley had anything to do with them. Baker, on the other hand, seems to have given little evidence of any strong partisanship.

⁶ See Narcissus Luttrell, *A brief historical relation of state affairs* (6 vols.; Oxford, 1857), VI, 505.

⁷ Steele's reply to her letter is printed in Aitken's *Life*, I, 262.

Professor Anderson seems to have overlooked the fact that if one accepts the ascription of authorship to Thomas Baker in the case of the Bragge-Baldwin *Female Tatler*, one can find considerable evidence supporting his conclusion.

1. Baker's dedication to *The fine lady's airs* (printed 1709) contains an avowal of his purpose to "throw it entirely by" (i.e., the writing of drama) and to aim at something "which may prove more serviceable to the Publick, and beneficial to my self."

2. "Bavius," a writer of rejected comedies (mentioned in the *Tatler*, No. 91), was early identified as Baker, whose last play appeared on the stage in 1709, whereas years had passed since Mrs. Manley's plays had been seen in the theater. This point becomes of some importance because of the very intimate knowledge of players, and the active interest in the stage, shown in the *Female Tatler* (see Nos. 3, 5, 6, 10, 11, 37, 39, 47, 52, and 69). On the other hand, Mrs. Manley showed in the *New Atalantis*, published in the same year, very little interest in actors or the stage. Imoinda, referred to several times satirically in the *Female Tatler*, was undoubtedly Mrs. Rogers⁸—an actress who had played Belinda in Baker's *Tunbridge Walks* at Drury Lane in 1703. The Ap Shinkins of Wales mentioned as among Mrs. Crackenthorpe's suitors in *Female Tatler*, No. 43, appeared also in Baker's *Hempstead Heath* (1706). Moreover, it is important to notice that no scurrilous references to Bickerstaff occur in the *Female Tatler* until after the story about "Bavius," a writer of rejected comedies, appeared in the *Tatler* (No. 91). After this the *Female Tatler's* abuse of Bickerstaff is fairly constant.

3. Baker employed in *Tunbridge Walks* (1703) the motto "*Ridetem dicere verum quid vetat?*" The same line appears no less than twenty-five times in the Bragge-Baldwin *Female Tatler*, as the motto at the head of the paper.

4. Thomas D'Urfey was attacked by the author of the *Female Tatler* both before and after Mrs. Manley was thought by Professor Anderson to have severed her connection with the paper (see Nos. 26 and 95); while in the preface to his *Modern prophets* in 1709 D'Urfey mentions Baker as one of two "bloody male criticks" from whose "barbarous assassinating attempts" he had suffered. The animus

⁸ See Genest, II, 70, 401.

shown toward D'Urfey is, therefore, common to Baker and the *Female Tatler*.

5. It is obvious from Mrs. Crackenthorpe's own observations that her supposed sex was doubted even in her own day (see Nos. 11 and 47). She was, in other words, thought to be the creation of a man.

Such are the evidences, very circumstantial, no doubt, which one finds supporting the ascription of authorship to Thomas Baker. At least they create, taken together, a strong presumption in favor of the Baker tradition.

In view of the confusion resulting from the existence of two periodicals with the same title, and their conflicting claims and contradictory statements, the problems of authorship will probably never be solved in any satisfactory way. Until a more conclusive case can be made for Mrs. Manley, or some other contemporary, it appears better to accept the tradition that Thomas Baker was the author of the Bragge-Baldwin *Female Tatler*. In any event, the case which Professor Anderson has ingeniously erected for Mrs. Manley's authorship can hardly be accepted until further explanations are made.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

SHENSTONE, GRAY, AND THE "MORAL ELEGY"

J. FISHER

THE eighteenth century saw interesting developments in the history of the alternately rhyming pentameter quatrain—the meter of such diverse poems as Davies' *Nosce te ipsum*, D'Avenant's *Gondibert*, Dryden's *Annus mirabilis*, and Gray's *Elegy*. First, this meter became the recognized "elegiac stanza," and the terms "elegiac stanza" and "elegy" became almost synonymous. Second, in the latter half of the century it enjoyed a popularity unparalleled in its history before or since. Third, it became in the same period a favorite meter for the poem of moral reflection, and the "moral elegy" came to be a recognized elegiac type. All these developments in its history have been regarded until recent years as due to the popularity and influence of Gray's *Elegy*. In a previous article,¹ however, the present writer gave evidence to show that it was James Hammond who, before Gray, made this quatrain "elegiac"; and, further, that Gray must yield to Hammond some of the credit for its later popularity. The purpose of the present article is to consider the contribution made by another poet, William Shenstone, to the history of the elegiac meter: first to show and second to discuss the implications of the fact that possibly all Shenstone's twenty-six *Elegies* were in manuscript circulation before Gray's *Elegy* was published.

I. THE DATE OF SHENSTONE'S "ELEGIES"

It was in 1764 that the Dodsleys published two volumes of *The works in verse and prose of William Shenstone, Esq; most of which were never before printed*. The twenty-six *Elegies*, written on many different occasions, introduced by "A prefatory essay on elegy," constitute the first item of the first volume. They fall, individually and collectively, into the category of works "never before printed," but it can be shown that Shenstone began the composition of them more than twenty years earlier. The evidence consists partly of internal allusions in the

¹ "James Hammond and the quatrain of Gray's *Elegy*," in *MP*, XXXII (1935), 301-10.
[MODERN PHILOLOGY, February, 1937] 273

Elegies themselves, but mostly of external allusions in Shenstone's published and unpublished correspondence.²

It should be emphasized, first, that there is a strong element of autobiography in both the elegies and the letters of Shenstone. The *Elegies* contain references to particular incidents in his life and reveal a portrait of his mind over a certain period;³ the correspondence is, in effect, a diary which may serve as a running commentary upon the *Elegies*, and help to decide when a particular incident happened, or at what date Shenstone assumed a certain attitude of mind.⁴ The combined evidence of the *Elegies* and the letters will help to determine not only the general period during which the *Elegies* were composed but also the probable date of an individual elegy. First, then, for the evidence as to the general period of composition.

In a letter to Graves of February 16, 1743, Shenstone outlines various poetic projects:

I cannot, *conscientiously*, print anything. I have two or three little matters in hand: none that I am greatly fond of, much less that are at all mature. One is. . . . Another, "Elegies in Hammond's Metre," but upon *real* and natural subjects: this I have objections to.⁵

² The manuscript sources, all in the British Museum, of the allusions quoted in this article are as follows: Add. MS 28958, which contains Shenstone's letters to Lady Luxborough between August 10, 1747, and May 14, 1755; Add. MS 28959, which contains Robert Dodsley's letters to Shenstone between February 9, 1756, and April 3, 1759, and also three replies from Shenstone; Add. MS 23728, which contains letters from Frances, countess of Hertford and later duchess of Somerset, to Henrietta, Lady Luxborough, and also extracts from letters by Shenstone. Add. MS 28221, which contains the correspondence of Shenstone and Percy between 1757 and 1763, was published, chiefly for its interest in connection with the history of the ballad, by Hans Hecht in 1909.

The printed sources of the allusions quoted are the edition of Shenstone's *Letters* published by James Dodsley in 1769 as Vol. III of the *Works*; Thomas Hull's edition, in two volumes, of *Select letters* from the correspondence of Shenstone and his circle; the *Letters*, printed in 1775, of Lady Luxborough to Shenstone; and Richard Graves's biographical *Recollection* of Shenstone (1788).

³ Cf. the "Prefatory essay on elegy": "The author of the following elegies entered on his subjects *occasionally*, as particular incidents in his life *suggested*, or dispositions of mind *recommended* them to his choice." Cf. also a letter to Graves dated "About 1745" (Dodsley, p. 116), in which Shenstone says that he has transcribed his (fourth) elegy, and continues: "I have amused myself often with this species of writing since you saw me; partly to divert my present *impatience*, and partly as it will be a picture of most that passes in my mind; a portrait which *friends* may value."

⁴ Cf. Shenstone's letters to Graves of July 15 and October 23, 1754 (Dodsley, pp. 265 and 289), in which respectively he comments on the destruction of his letters to his recently deceased friend Whistler as follows: "It is from a few letters of my own or others alone, that I am able to recollect what I have been doing since I was born," and "I considered them as the records of a *friendship* that will be always *dear* to me; and as the *history* of my *mind* for these twenty years last past."

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 77.

Shenstone therefore began writing elegies in imitation of Hammond's meter, and in reaction against his material. As Hammond's elegies appeared late in 1742, the first months of 1743 are the earliest possible date for any elegy by Shenstone. There is additional evidence to support this statement. Graves writes: "Mr. Hammond's 'Love Elegies,' which had been published a year or two before, suggested the idea to Mr. Shenstone; and he has adopted his metre. . . ."⁶ This assertion corroborates, and may be based upon, Shenstone's statement. Added to this, the earliest allusions in the *Elegies* which can possibly influence the question of date are to the deaths of Hammond and Somerville, which both occurred in the summer of 1742. And Shenstone's objections to the scheme evidently vanished quickly, for there is almost certain evidence that Elegies IV and XIX were written in the first months of 1743, and Elegy VII about the end of the same year. In a letter to Graves of July 3, 1743, also, Shenstone comments upon a packet of books which he has received and which evidently included Hammond's *Love elegies*: "But sure Hammond has no right to the least *inventive* merit, as the preface-writer would insinuate. I do not think there is a single thought, of any eminence, that is not literally translated."⁷ Shenstone was right: Hammond had merely imitated certain of the elegies of Tibullus. It follows that any of Shenstone's elegies which show the influence of either Hammond or Tibullus were probably written early, since Shenstone must have studied both poets closely in order to risk so definite a statement about Hammond.

Graves tells us that Shenstone "occasionally wrote most of his elegies" about the time when he had just begun to embellish his country seat, "The Leasowes."⁸ Shenstone began this in 1745, when he took possession of "The Leasowes" on the death of his guardian, Thomas Dolman. According to Graves, then, the year 1745 marks the climax of Shenstone's elegy-writing. This statement also is supported by additional evidence. In the letter already referred to as dated "About 1745," Shenstone tells Graves that he has transcribed one of his elegies, and continues: "I have amused myself often with this species of writing since you saw me. . . ."⁹ This may be the source of Graves's statement. Further, the scenery of "The Leasowes" forms the background of the *Elegies*, and Shenstone himself in the "Prefatory

⁶ P. 114.

⁷ Dodsley, p. 98.

⁸ Pp. 113-14.

⁹ See n. 3.

essay" writes: "If he describes a rural landskip, or unfolds the train of sentiments it inspired, he fairly drew his picture from the spot. . . . The flocks, the meadows, and the grottos are *his own*, and the embellishment of *his farm* his sole amusement." He says in the same passage that he "retired early to country-solitudes," that "the sentiments were therefore inspired by nature, and that in the earlier part of his life," and Shenstone was not quite forty-nine when he died in 1763. Two other items of evidence in his letters may be quoted. In 1747 he tells Richard Jago: "I have an alcove, six elegies . . . [etc.] . . . to show you when you come."¹⁰ Since it was Shenstone's habit to send copies of his poems to his friends as soon as they were written, a reference to six elegies in 1747 must, on the evidence above, be to six new elegies which Jago had not seen before. On December 18, 1748, Shenstone sent Lady Luxborough his elegies in a manuscript book, with the comment: "I know them to be very imperfect, several Things want to be accomodated to y^e present time, &c. . . ."¹¹ This implies that even by the end of 1748 several elegies in that book were some years old. Lastly, the "Prefatory essay on elegy" is likely to have been written when Shenstone had had sufficient practice in elegy to be able to generalize with authority about it. He was considered an authority on the elegy by his friends as early as 1747, when Jago was writing elegies under his influence, and considered himself an authority at least as early as July 30, 1749, when he asked Lady Luxborough: "Pray, my Lady, who is y^t. Warwickshire clergyman that supplants me in my Province of Elegy, and addresses y^r. Ladyship?"¹² However, the *Essay* itself refers to Pope, who died in 1744, as "lately deceased," while Dodsley appends to a passage in it a footnote which runs, "N.B. This preface was written near twenty years ago," that is, nearly twenty years before 1764. It is reasonable to conclude, then, that the essay was written in 1745 or soon after.

Shenstone's *Elegies* were begun early in 1743; most of them were written about 1745; when were they completed? Graves, in his *Recollection*, points out the obvious parallels between Gray's *Elegy* and those of Shenstone, and adds a warning footnote: "To obviate any suspicion of plagiarism, or even imitation, most of Mr. Shenstone's elegies were written long before Mr. Gray's elegy was published."¹³

¹⁰ Dodsley, p. 142.

¹¹ Add. MS 28958.

¹² *Ibid.*

¹³ P. 142.

Gray's *Elegy* was published on February 15, 1751. Graves's statement therefore implies that the majority of the *Elegies* had been written long before 1751, some shortly before 1751, and possibly one or two after 1751. The difficulty is to name any elegy written after 1751, or even after 1750, except possibly for Elegy XXVI. Not only the great majority of Shenstone's *Elegies*, but also most of his poems, were written before 1750. After this date the new poetry that he wrote was insignificant both in quantity and in importance. Writing to Jago on February 27, 1753, he says: "As to writing [poetry] I have not attempted it this year and more: nor do I know when I shall again."¹⁴ This confession sums up Shenstone's attitude toward composition from 1750 to 1763. What he did during this period was to take up the poetry he had already written in the previous decade, revise and correct it, transcribe it into manuscript books illustrated with pencil and water color, circulate copies of it among admiring friends with requests that they point out faults and suggest improvements, and prepare it for publication at an indefinite date. The application of these habits to the *Elegies* themselves can be traced in Shenstone's correspondence, and two facts stand out. From about 1747 onward Shenstone refers to them as "my elegies" and his friends as "your elegies"; from about 1748 onward he considered publishing them. The only conclusion is that since in 1748 he had a number of elegies large enough to be regarded as a series ready for publication, the year 1748 is an important one in the process of their composition, a year in which he seems to have determined not to write any more elegies, but after which he possibly added one or two elegies to his manuscript book. What is more, these references in his correspondence are continuous from 1747 to the day of his death, and since they not only afford evidence of date but also tell the story of publication and throw light upon Shenstone's methods of composition and correction, a full account of them is probably justified.

On June 30, 1747, Shenstone informed Graves: "I want to correct my elegies, by your assistance.—I will begin no more."¹⁵ On September 20 he told Jago: "I have wrote out my elegies, and heartily wish you had them to look over before I come."¹⁶ On February 14, 1748, he wrote to the same friend: "I have sometimes thought of printing my

¹⁴ Add. MS 23728.

¹⁵ Dodsley, p. 136.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 147.

next title-page thus, viz. 'Poems; consisting of Songs, Odes, and Elegies, with an improved edition of The Judgement of Hercules, and of The Schoolmistress.'¹⁷ On June 1 he informed Lady Luxborough:

I have written a pretty large collection of Elegies on almost every Melancholy subject yt. I cou'd recollect; & I had some Thoughts of sending them to ye. Press next winter, but I have now dropt yt. Design, as my Friends advise me to publish something else yt. may be of more *general* acceptation. I own they are in some degree fav'rites with me, & if your Ladyship will please to read them in a Copy, (which I have now no leisure to transcribe,) I will send them very soon.¹⁸

On September 11 he informed Jago: ". . . the next thing I do will be to transcribe my elegies."¹⁹ On September 25 he informed Lady Luxborough: "I . . . am now writing out my lamentable Elegies in a Book as red as Blood. . . ."²⁰ On November 9 he informed her: "I am now afraid of what I have hitherto sought opportunities of indulging; I mean, that pleasing melancholy wch. suits my Temper *too well*. This your Ladyship will discover by some very *solemn* Elegies wch. I shall shortly put into your Hands."²¹ Shenstone fulfilled this promise, and on December 1 sent her the "Book" of "Elegies," with a request that she make some mark on what she should "least dislike."²² On December 30 he repeated his request, hinting that the elegies might probably have to "go thro many other Hands."²³ On January 4, 1749, she replied that "they will please better judges, as they do me."²⁴ All these allusions, it should be remembered, are continuous for three years before Gray's *Elegy* was finished in June, 1750. However, on October 25, 1751, Miss Dolman returned to Shenstone a "Collection of Poems" which he had lent her, asserted that did she not believe they were to be printed soon, she would transcribe some of them, and added: ". . . but something whispers me in my Ear, that you really design those charming Elegies for the Press shortly, and that they will no longer be concealed in the little secret Box, from whence I remember I was so rude as to steal them."²⁵ Allusions to the elegies are lacking for the next four years, but appear again in Robert Dodsley's correspondence with Shenstone,²⁶ which began on February 9, 1756. From

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 152.

¹⁸ Add. MS 28958.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*

²⁰ Hull, I, 124.

²¹ Add. MS 28958.

²² *Ibid.*

²³ Add. MS 23728.

²⁴ Add. MS 28959.

²⁵ Dodsley, p. 169.

²⁶ *Ibid.*

this date onward Dodsley tried every method of inducing Shenstone to surrender his elegies for publication; his persevering efforts in this respect are a feature of the correspondence. In his first letter Dodsley expressed disappointment that he must "give up all hopes of printing your Elegies this winter," and threatened, if Shenstone continued to delay, that he would "sit down in Vengeance, and write an Elegy on the Barrenness of your Muse, on the decay of your own abilities, or on some other scandalous Subject, that shall blast your Character as an able Poet for ever." On August 28, he told Shenstone that he was neglecting "the Goddess of Fame; who, I heard you say (indeed you did not name the Lady) had waited at your door five years in expectation of certain Elegies which you had promis'd her. . . ." This reference implies that the elegies were ready for publication by 1751 at the latest. On October 5, he told Shenstone that Akenside sent his compliments, hoped to be acquainted with him, and "longs much to see your Elegies." On November 8, referring to "an Impostor" called "Indolence," he told Shenstone: "I am apprehensive he hath a wicked Intention of suppressing your Elegies"; on January 11, 1757, he lamented: "Not a word of the Elegies!" and on February 17 he sent Shenstone the *Elegies* of Whitehead, with a significant hint which Shenstone, in a letter to Graves of March 7, shows that he understood when he referred to the gift as "design'd by my worthy friend to excite my emulation.—Alas! that I am so ill able to deserve the encouragements which I receive from him."²⁷ But Dodsley continued his unenviable task in letters of March 11, August 28, and December 13, and at one point seemed within sight of a certain measure of success. Writing to Shenstone on September 20, he said: "I have shew'd Dr. Akenside your Elegy; he is prodigiously struck with it, & hopes you will some time or other before 'tis long, let the public enjoy the pleasure of the whole Collection." Shenstone replied on December 21, lamenting that Dodsley was printing off the sheets (for Vols. V and VI of Dodsley's *Collection*) faster than he expected, and added: "I hope y^e. Elegy is not yet begun in Sheet B.; and even thus, if it were not inconvenient to stop y^e. Press a little, I would rather it were done, yⁿ. otherwise. . . ." Dodsley replied on January 16, 1758: "Thus far I had written, & was just going to close my letter, when your cruel prohibition of Jessy ar-

²⁷ Dodsley, p. 303.

riv'd—God grant me patience!—but you cannot be in earnest!" The reference to "Jessy" identifies the elegy in question as Elegy XXVI. From the passages quoted, it is obvious that Dodsley had the elegy in his possession, and that Shenstone in effect snatched it from the compositor's hands. Dodsley's natural annoyance was mollified by Shenstone's offer of a substitute for the poem he had recalled, for Dodsley wrote on January 21: "I find that you have enabled me to fill Sheet C without the help of Jessy, but I hope what I said in my last, will induce you to revoke her doom." Nevertheless Dodsley still persisted, and letters of February 2 and March 15 lament the loss of the elegy. The next reference shows the elegies going still farther afield. Shenstone told Graves on July 22, 1758, that Dodsley and Joseph Spence had stayed a week at "The Leasowes" on their way to Scotland, and on November 25 that Spence "took my Elegies into Scotland, and sent them back on his return, with a sheet or two of criticisms, and an handsome letter."²⁸ Spence wrote this letter from Durham on August 19,²⁹ but there Dodsley had parted from him, taking the elegies with him, and we find him writing on August 22 from Pall Mall, sending Shenstone the elegies and expressing the hope that he will "lose no time in putting them to press." Dodsley continued the campaign in letters of September 19 and October 14, 1758, and began the new year with a further request on January 20. His efforts seem to have had some effect, for on April 18, 1759, we find Shenstone informing Graves: "I have indeed *thoughts* (for I never use the word *resolutions*) of publishing my Elegies next winter. . . ."³⁰ On December 1 Dodsley, optimistic as ever, suggested to Shenstone: "What think you of an Elegy on the Death of General Wolfe?"³¹ Next enters Bishop Percy who, in a letter to Shenstone of March 12, 1760, referred, speaking of the elegies, to "that fine Collection which you show'd me in MS."³² On December 19, 1761, he wrote: "I am glad to hear you think of giving the world a standard Edition of your Poems. . . ."³³ On February 11, 1763, death put an end to Shenstone's vacillation and leveled the publisher's greatest obstacle, and at last, in 1764, the *Elegies* were published by Dodsley. They can thus be traced back, existing as a large series, from 1764 to 1747. And evidence as to the dates of individual elegies seems

²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 316.

²⁹ Hull, I, 242.

³⁰ Dodsley, p. 331.

³¹ Hull, I, 272.

³² Add. MS 28221.

³³ *Ibid.*

to show that with the possible exception of Elegy XXVI the "many different occasions" on which the *Elegies* were written all fall within the period 1743-49. Next, then, for the dates of the individual elegies.

Of the twenty-six *Elegies*, three can be dated from their titles. Elegy XIX is entitled: "Written in spring 1743"; and Elegy XXI: "Written at the time of a rumoured tax upon luxury. 1746." Elegy VIII has the title: "He describes his early love of poetry, and its consequences. To Mr. G(raves). 1745," but a footnote is added to this date: "N.B. Written after the death of Mr. POPE." Pope died on May 30, 1744, and the modification of date suggested by the footnote is explained by the allusion in the ninth stanza to "TWITNAM's widow'd bow'r."

Elegies IV and VII are dated by Richard Graves. He says of Elegy IV:

Mr. Shenstone's first elegy [the fourth in the collection] is that called "Ophelia's Urn," inscribed to Mr. G—s, and alludes to a real urn, which he had erected in the church at M(ic)kl(eto)n, in memory of an extraordinary young woman, Utrecia Smith, the daughter of a worthy and learned clergyman. . . . A clergyman lover broke off his connection with her, which resulted in her death.³⁴

The urn, according to the Latin inscription, which Graves transcribes in a footnote, and which contains the initials "R. G." and the date "M.DCC.XLIV.," was erected by Graves. Whatever the Roman date signifies, Elegy IV must have been written in the first months of 1743 if it is the first that Shenstone wrote, for Elegy XIX was "Written in spring 1743."³⁵ Of Elegy VII Graves says:

This elegy was written about the end of the year 1743, After Mr. Shenstone's return from Cheltenham. In his way thither, he had missed his road, and wandered till ten o'clock at night on the Cotswold Hills. He lay's the scene on Orwell's banks, as Wolsey was born at Ipswich, in Suffolk.³⁶

Shenstone describes this mishap in a letter that is undated but placed between letters dated "1743" and "July the 9th, 1743."³⁷ The letter is addressed to Graves.

³⁴ P. 115.

³⁵ The assignment of an early date to this elegy is supported by an allusion to it in the letter to Graves dated "About 1745" (see nn. 3 and 9), where Shenstone compares the tragedies of this "Ophelia" and Shakespeare's.

³⁶ P. 118.

³⁷ Dodsley, pp. 93 and 94.

Of the other elegies which can be dated with fair certainty, Elegy XXIII offers no difficulty. The ninth stanza refers to Lucy, Lady Lyttelton ("Lucia"), as dead, and to James Thomson as living; it was therefore written between January 19, 1747, and August 27, 1748, on which respective dates Lady Lyttelton and Thomson died. Elegy XIII, also, almost certainly refers in its eighth stanza to Shenstone's illness in the winter of 1748-49; the same illness was the subject of his "Irregular Ode after Sickness. 1749."

Elegy XIV is one of the most interesting of the series. "Declining an invitation to visit foreign countries, he takes occasion to intimate the advantages of his own. To lord TEMPLE"—so runs the title. From the fifteenth stanza to the end of the poem, Shenstone moralizes on the death of "GREENVILLE," and a footnote to this passage runs: "Written about the time of captain GREENVILLE's death." But Chalmers in his *English poets* changes this footnote: "Written a few years after captain Grenville's death, which happened in 1747. The earldom of Temple was not created till 1749."³⁸ Captain Thomas Grenville was killed on May 3, 1747, in Anson's naval action with the French off Cape Finisterre—but this is not the point. On December 18, 1748, Shenstone sent Lady Luxborough his manuscript book of elegies, with the comment: "The Seventh in y^e. order they now stand was partly design'd to commemorate my Lord Beauchamp; but I am convinc'd it wou'd be a cruel office to the Dutches instead of a kind one."³⁹ On January 4, 1749, Lady Luxborough replied:

The seventh Elegy I like as well as any I have had time to look over, and was the more inclined to read it, as you had Lord Beauchamp in view in the latter part: but I am apt to think that the Duchess would rather be *hurt* than *pleased* at the application of it, because the late Duke was so barbarous as to say that she sent her son *over* to kill him.—Might not the Elegy end as properly at the fourteenth stanza "the beauties of Britannia's mind?"⁴⁰

The last reference identifies the elegy in question, for the last verse of the fourteenth stanza of Elegy XIV runs: "'Tis the rich beauties of BRITANNIA's mind." What, then, had happened? The obituary of the *Gentleman's magazine* for September, 1744, includes: "Lord Beauchamp, only son to the Earl of Hertford, and only grandson in the male line to the Duke of Somerset, of the small-pox at Boulogne in Italy, on Sept. 11th, his birth-day."⁴¹ According to the prefatory biographical

³⁸ XIII, 273.

³⁹ Add. MS 28958.

⁴⁰ *Letters* (1775), p. 81.

⁴¹ P. 565.

notes to Add. MS 23728, where an extract of Lady Luxborough's letter is given, the Earl accused the Duchess of having killed his son, because she did not have him inoculated before he went abroad. Between September 11, 1744, and December 18, 1748, Shenstone wrote an elegy in which from the fifteenth stanza to the end he made Lord Beauchamp's tragedy a strong illustration of his unwillingness "to visit foreign countries." On December 18, 1748, he expressed to Lady Luxborough his doubts as to whether the close of the elegy was in good taste. She gave it as her opinion on January 4, 1749, that it was not, and advised him to make the elegy end with the last line of the fourteenth stanza. Shenstone omitted the offending stanzas and added in their place four new stanzas relating to the death of Captain Grenville, and the elegy appeared in this form in 1764. The first fourteen stanzas, therefore, were written between 1744 and 1748, probably about 1745; the last four were added to these after January 4, 1749, probably early in 1749, and may have been written in 1747. Thus Dodsley's footnote, and Chalmers' altered form of it, are both incorrect, for these men did not know the inner history of an elegy which enables us to watch Shenstone in the act of composition.

Elegies XV and XXVI are the only others mentioned in Shenstone's correspondence. Referring to the Harborough estate, and to the Penn family, Shenstone told Graves on July 15, 1754: "I have a kind of romantic veneration for that *place* and *family*; which, if you remember, I have expressed in one of my best elegies."⁴² A footnote tells us that the reference is to "Elegy XV," which was therefore written before July 15, 1754. But the phrase "if you remember," especially when used to so old and close a friend as Graves, must mean "a long time ago." The elegy celebrates his maternal ancestors and the estate which he inherited from them; it is therefore likely to have been written about 1745, when he took possession of the estate. Elegy XXVI, as has been shown, is the "poor Jessy" which Dodsley saw slip from his hands when it was on the point of publication. There are six references to it by Dodsley between September 20, 1757 and March 15, 1758; it was therefore written before the first of these dates; the number of references can be explained by Dodsley's natural wrath on the occasion, and the lateness of the first reference by the fact that the correspondence only began in 1756. But this elegy seems dissociated

⁴² Dodsley, p. 265.

from the rest: it tells a tragic story; it is a ballad crusted over with the sentimentalism of the period; it occurs last in the series of elegies as published in 1764, and the fact that Shenstone was willing to part with it of all others is significant; it may therefore be the one example of an elegy written by Shenstone after Gray's *Elegy* was published, though there is nothing to prove this and evidence as to the general period of composition points the other way.

Three elegies—III, XVIII, and XXII—can be dated only uncertainly. Elegy III is "On the untimely death of a certain learned acquaintance." It laments "Alcon," a poet who died "in meagre want forlorn." The only poet of Shenstone's acquaintance who died in these circumstances during the decade 1740–50 was William Somerville, who had been introduced to Shenstone by Richard Jago, Somerville's school friend. Somerville died on July 14, 1742, and if he is the "learned acquaintance," the elegy was written probably in 1743 or 1744.⁴³ Elegy XVIII is entitled: "He repeats the song of COLLIN, a discerning shepherd; lamenting the state of the woollen manufactory." Collin, a footnote tells us, is Somerville: the first stanza refers to him as dead, and the second refers to "lost Ophelia," the subject of Elegy III (1743). These allusions would suit a date of 1743 or 1744.⁴⁴ Elegy XXII is entitled: "Written in the year —— when the rights of sepulture were so frequently violated." Body-snatching was prevalent throughout the eighteenth century until the Act of 1832, which killed it. But just before 1740, private schools of anatomy began to spring up in large

⁴³ In a letter to Jago, wrongly dated "1741" (Dodsley, p. 55), Shenstone describes, in a passage quoted by Johnson at the beginning of his life of Somerville, his grief at the "distress of circumstances" in which Somerville died. He refers to the death of Somerville elsewhere in the *Elegies* and in the correspondence. He inscribed an urn at "The Leasowes" as "Ingenio et Amicitiae Gulielmi Somerville."

⁴⁴ With regard to the evidence of the title, the historians and economists testify that the woollen industry was in a lamentable state before, during, and after the decade 1740–50. However, the references in the eighth stanza to French piracy and in the eleventh to Spain as a "haughty foe" indicate that this elegy was written during the war of the Spanish succession, into which England joined after Walpole's fall in 1742, and which closed in 1748 with the Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle; this limits the date to the period 1743–48. The invocation to Britons in the closing stanzas points to the time when the Patriots were clamoring for war with France, who threatened British naval supremacy; this national excitement led to the Treaty of Worms, September 13, 1743. The evidence of the *Gentleman's Magazine* may also serve to corroborate a date of 1743 or 1744. Complaints would be voiced in such a periodical when an evil had reached a crisis. Of the numbers throughout the period 1740–50, only those for the year 1743 discuss the woollen crisis, and almost every number for that year discusses it. As in Shenstone's elegy, the cause of the crisis is given as French competition, and the stricken locality is the West. The March number, for instance, quotes from the *Champion* for March 3 a lament from the "Woollen Manufacturers in the West," which begins: "Sir, the lamentable Condition of the Woollen Trade, especially in these Parts, is a thing so universally known. . . ."

numbers; it was these institutions that caused the evil, for while the teaching of anatomy was restricted to the Company of Barbers and Surgeons, which by an Act of Henry VIII had a right to the bodies of executed malefactors, there was no need for resurrected bodies.⁴⁵ In the period 1740-50, then, the evil would have become so progressively acute as to excite protest. In the *Gentleman's magazine*, only the numbers for 1747 during this decade protest against the evil, which at this time would not be so familiar as to gain acquiescence.⁴⁶ A possible date of 1747 can therefore be assigned to this elegy.

Thirteen of the *Elegies* can thus be dated definitely or within narrow limits. The remainder can only be dated either "early" or "late" in the general period when the series was written. Shenstone himself says of the *Elegies* in the Prefatory essay: ". . . the subsequent ones may sometimes seem a recantation of the preceding. The reader will scarcely impute this to oversight; but will allow, that men's opinions as well as tempers vary." The "early" and "late" elegies each portray a distinct attitude of mind, and it is only possible to show from the correspondence when Shenstone assumed these attitudes.

In the "early" period, from 1743 to about 1746, Shenstone divided his time between his lodgings in Fleet Street and his retirement at "The Leasowes." In London he was evidently trying to build up a career, and we find him writing to Graves from the City in 1743: "Everyone gets posts, preferments, but myself.—Nothing but my ambition can set me on a footing with them, and make me easy."⁴⁷ He had also ambitions with regard to poetry, for in a letter to Jago of 1741 occurs the phrase, "till I was made Poet-Laureat, and you Bishop of Winchester,"⁴⁸ while toward "The Leasowes," the embellishment of which was to become his life's task, he had two attitudes. One is revealed in a letter to Jago of 1741, in which he relates how he has returned to "The Leasowes" after a visit and is weary of the place:

I am infinitely pleased (though it is a gloomy joy) with the application of Dr. Swift's complaint, "that he is forced to die in a rage, like a poisoned rat in a hole." My soul is no more suited to the figure I make, than a cable rope to

⁴⁵ See J. B. Bailey, *Diary of a resurrectionist*, chap. II.

⁴⁶ The October number has a letter from a correspondent suggesting ways and means for the prevention of body-snatching; this is accompanied by editorial comments which mention other letters received on the same subject. The September number records the conviction of three men for an especially bold crime in which the body of Sacheverell was resurrected.

⁴⁷ Dodsley, p. 82.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 46.

a cambrie needle:—I cannot bear to see the advantages alienated, which I think I could deserve and relish so much more than those that have them.”

Here, then, his business or political ambitions made him disgusted with a country life. But he was also ambitious with regard to “The Leasowes,” and in June, 1742, he wrote to Graves:

I do not know whether it be from the prejudice of being born at The Leasowes, or from any real beauty in the situation; but I would wish no other, would some one, by an addition of two hundred pounds a year, put it in my power to exhibit my own designs. It is what I can now do in no other method than on paper.⁵⁰

He was also ambitious in love, and conducted one or more affairs which Graves in his *Recollection* mentions but does not date. They are referred to, however, in a letter to Jago of 1743, where Shenstone says: “I know not what you have heard of my amour,”⁵¹ and in two letters to Graves of 1745:

It is long since I considered myself as *undone*, The *world* will not perhaps consider me in that light entirely, till I have married my maid.⁵²

My amour, so far as I indulge it, gives me some pleasure, and no pain in the world.⁵³

Add to this early ambition his early interest in Tibullus, and in Hammond who, like Somerville, died in the summer of 1742, and any elegy which portrays the conditions of mind just described is likely to have been written in the period 1743–46, since the *Elegies* are autobiographical. Taking in order the elegies not yet dated, then, Elegy I refers to “love-sick HAMMOND” as dead; the last two stanzas contain the sentiments of Tibullus; and the first stanza says in effect: “I left the venality of London for the calm solitude of The Leasowes,” which he did in 1745. Elegy II is chiefly concerned with Hammond’s death; it refers to Lyttelton fondly gracing his bier, to mourning at his tomb, and to the possibility of his Delia placing votive wreaths upon it, while the last stanza asks “Britons” to shun “cold interest” and foster “patriot arduous.” Elegies V and VI are concerned with love. Elegy IX refers to the death of Somerville; its sentiments are those of Tibullus, and the last stanza contains a line that is taken directly from Tibullus:

Let others toil to gain the sordid ore

Divitias alius fulvo sibi congerat auro [I. i. 1].

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 44.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p. 80.

⁵² *Ibid.*, p. 120.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, p. 65.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 117.

Elegies XX and XXV are love elegies, in the style of Hammond and Tibullus, addressed to Delia. All these elegies are therefore probably "early."

In the "late" period, from 1746 to about 1749, the chief condition of Shenstone's mind was disillusionment. He had retired to "The Leasowes" in 1745, and from that time onward he made it a hermitage. He had begun the embellishment of it, but had been rudely hindered at times by lack of funds. Many of his oldest friends had died. He had lost his former warm hopes and ambitions, and had settled down to his melancholy; his correspondence, and some of his elegies, became full of complaint. Taking the remaining elegies in order, then, in Elegy X he repines at the frugal dispensations of Fortune: he has had to "leave the rising wall," that is, stop building on his estate because of lack of funds; he has had to "Check the fond love of art that fir'd my veins," and he is left to recall his former "warm hopes." In Elegy XI, "He complains how soon the pleasing novelty of life is over." It is another poem of disillusionment, recalling his former ambition:

Scarce has the sun sev'n annual courses roll'd,
Scarce shewn the whole that fortune can supply;
Since, not the miser so caress'd his gold,
As I, for what it gave, was heard to sigh.

It has been shown that Shenstone sighed for various things in 1741 and 1742 and, making allowance for the "sev'n annual courses," this elegy may have been written about 1748. Elegy XII is a "recantation" of Elegy XI, evidently in a moment of optimism, and can be dated just after it. Elegy XVII is reminiscent of past happiness: it laments the deaths of old friends and, among these, describes the Muse "weeping o'er LUCINDA's urn." This is probably a reference to the mourning at Hagley over the death of Lucy, Lady Lyttelton, which occurred in January, 1747, and the elegy may have been written in that year. Elegies XVI and XXIV cannot be dated definitely, but were probably written within the period 1743-49.

Judging by evidence as to the general period of composition and as to the dates of individual elegies, then, the conclusion is that all Shenstone's *Elegies*, with one possible exception, were written not only before Gray's *Elegy* was published but perhaps before the end of 1749, after a beginning made in the first months of 1743.

II. THE DATE OF GRAY'S "ELEGY"

The full evidence as to the date of Gray's *Elegy* can be found in the Oxford edition of the poem published in 1929 by Mr. F. G. Stokes. What follows here is merely what the argument of this article demands.

First, then, there is no foundation in fact for the statement generally accepted in the nineteenth century and often repeated in the twentieth that the *Elegy* was begun in 1742: the sole item of evidence for it is a conjecture made by William Mason, transformed into fact by John Mitford, and accepted as fact by late nineteenth-century editors such as Edmund Gosse and John Bradshaw.⁵⁴ Those who, like Mr. Stokes, nevertheless find 1742 "a tempting date," can do so only on the grounds that Mason's opinion carries great weight or that the *Elegy* originally arose out of a mood brought upon Gray by the death of Richard West, which occurred on June 1, 1742. Mason, it is true, was Gray's friend and literary executor; it is certain also that Gray either showed or described the poem in its manuscript state to him, because Mason persuaded Gray to change the title of the poem from "Stanza's wrote in a Country Church-yard," which occurs in the Fraser manuscript, to "An Elegy Wrote in a Country Church Yard," which occurs in the first edition.⁵⁵ But Mason did not meet Gray until 1747,⁵⁶ so that his conjecture can be of value only in so far as it is based upon information supplied by Gray himself. If Gray had supplied it, Mason would certainly have been content merely to quote Gray as the authority for his statement. But he does not mention Gray in the passage concerned: he takes the trouble to show exhaustively, in the "narrative" preceding the passage, that Gray in the autumn of 1742 was in low spirits as a result of accumulated misfortunes—the death of his father in September, 1741, the financial unwisdom of the father which recoiled upon the son, Gray's entrance into the univer-

⁵⁴ Mason, *Memoirs of Gray* (1775), p. 157: "I am inclined to believe that the Elegy in a Country Church-yard was begun, if not concluded, at this time also [i.e., 1742] . . ."; Mitford, *Works of Gray* (1814), p. xiv: "In the autumn of 1742 . . . The 'Elegy in a Country Church-yard' was commenced"; Gosse, *Works of Gray* (1884), I, 72: "The Elegy written in a Country Church-yard was begun at Stoke-Poges in the autumn of 1742. . . ."

⁵⁵ "He originally gave it only the simple title of 'Stanzas written in a Country Church-yard.' I persuaded him first to call it an ELEGY . . ." (Mason, *Memoirs* [1778], I, 162).

⁵⁶ ". . . it was not till about the year 1747 that I had the happiness of being introduced to the acquaintance of Mr. Gray" (*ibid.*, III, 70).

sity to take the degree of B.C.L. against his own wishes and in deference to those of his mother and aunts, his quarrel with Walpole, his loss of time abroad, and finally the death of his friend Richard West in June, 1742. In the "narrative" in which he dates the beginning of the *Elegy*, Mason mentions the Eton ode and the "Hymn to adversity," and connects them with Gray's grief on the death of Richard West. He thus offers only a personal conjecture based upon the evidence that a melancholy poem was begun at a melancholy time by a melancholy poet. On the other hand, there is good reason for believing that the beginning of the *Elegy* was connected with the death of Richard West—an event which Mason notices in his list of Gray's misfortunes. Two stanzas of the *Elegy* itself are indebted to poems by West.⁵⁷ The pathos of West's life and death, and the depth of Gray's attachment to him, are too well known to require further comment. And some lines of West's epistle *Ad amicos*, sent to Gray from Christ Church on July 4, 1737, after a severe illness, seem significant:

From you remote, methinks, alone I stand
Like some sad exile in a desert land
Few will lament my loss whene'er I die
Unknown and silent will depart my breath
Yet some there are (ere spent my vital days)
Within whose breast my tomb I wish to raise.
Lov'd in my life, lamented in my end,
Their praise would crown me as their precepts mend. . . .

This, to Gray, from a friend who never knew when his last moment was to come, sounds almost like a plea. And if Gray granted it in the *Elegy*, the Epitaph is the only place where he did so, for the rest of the poem is impersonal.⁵⁸ Even if this were so, however, a beginning for the *Elegy* in the definite year 1742 is not necessarily implied.

Some recent writers incline to the view that the *Elegy* was begun about 1746:⁵⁹ the evidence for this rests upon two letters sent by Horace Walpole to Mason on December 1 and 14, 1773, at a time when Mason was sending the various sections of his *Memoirs of Gray* to

⁵⁷ As the editors notice, the stanza beginning "The boast of heraldry" runs closely parallel to four lines of West's *Monody on the death of Caroline* (1737), at the end of which poem West also describes himself as "A Muse as yet unheeded and unknown," which compares closely with the line in the Epitaph, "A Youth to Fortune and to Fame unknown."

⁵⁸ See Odell Shepard, "A youth to fortune and to fame unknown," in *MP*, XX (1923), 347-73, for a discussion of the whole matter.

⁵⁹ E.g., D. C. Tovey, *Cambridge history of English literature*, X, 123.

Walpole for comment and approval. In the first of these letters Walpole told Mason that he had made some slight corrections and added:

But there are two errors in point of dates of more consequence. They relate to Cr  billon's works and *The Churchyard*, and I think you will alter them. . . . The Churchyard was, I am persuaded, posterior to West's death at least three or four years, as you will see by my note. At least I am sure that I had the twelve or more first lines from himself above three years after that period, and it was long before he finished it.⁶⁰

Mason did not accept the correction, and must have replied with strong arguments against it, for exactly a fortnight later, in his second letter, Walpole wrote again: "The note on Cr  billon is certainly of no importance. . . . Your account of the *Elegy* puts an end to my other criticism."⁶¹ Mason thus took the trouble to demolish Walpole's objections on both points, and those who know Mason's pompous self-importance may recognize in the second quotation from Walpole a note of tired resignation rather than of deference. Walpole accepted Mason's replies to his objections, but the impressive fact remains that on seeing in Mason's manuscript the date 1742 given as that of the beginning of the *Elegy*, he felt immediately that a serious error of several years had been made; in spite of the fact that he made the death of West the basis of his reckoning, he felt that the *Elegy* had really been begun several years after the year 1742. His words, "and it was long before he finished it," are evidently an objection to Mason's statement that the *Elegy* was begun, "if not concluded," in 1742, and we know from Gray's own testimony that Walpole here was right. On June 12, 1750, Gray wrote to Walpole from Stoke, inclosing a manuscript copy of the *Elegy*:

I have been here at Stoke a few days (where I shall continue a good part of the summer); and having put an end to a thing, whose beginning you have seen long ago, I immediately send it to you. You will, I hope, look upon it in the light of a *thing with an end to it*; a merit that most of my writings have wanted. . . .

Walpole says that he "had the twelve or more first lines from himself": Gray says that Walpole saw the beginning. Walpole says that this was three or four years after the death of West, which occurred on June 1, 1742: Gray merely says "long ago," but as he was not on

⁶⁰ *Letters*, ed. Toynbee, VIII, 371.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, p. 383.

friendly terms with Walpole from May, 1741, to November, 1745, Walpole's implied date of 1746 is given strong support, whereas Mason's date of 1742 is made practically impossible. Walpole says that "it was long before he finished" the *Elegy*; Gray in 1750 stresses the fact that he has "put an end" to it; Mason thinks that it may have been concluded in 1742.

The letters in which Mason answered Walpole's objections are unfortunately missing, but what evidence we have seems strongly in favor of Walpole, upon whose statements that about 1746 he saw "the twelve or more first lines" and that "it was long before he finished it" we must therefore fall back. What was this "beginning" which had been composed at some time before Walpole saw it, and what part did Gray add when he completed the poem?

If Richard West was in Gray's mind when he began the *Elegy*, and if the "Youth" of the Epitaph is West, Walpole's "twelve or more first lines" would, as some writers have suggested, be the three quatrains of the Epitaph. For evidence concerning the completion of the poem we may trust Mason, since the conclusion was almost certainly written after he had met Gray in 1747. To the passage in which he dates the beginning of the *Elegy* Mason adds: "I am aware that, as it stands at present the conclusion is of a later date: how that was originally, I have shewn in my notes on the poem." The note runs as follows:

In the first manuscript copy of this exquisite Poem, I find the conclusion different from that which he afterwards composed; and tho' his afterthought was unquestionably the best, yet there is a pathetic melancholy in the four rejected stanzas, which highly claims preservation. I shall therefore give them as a variation in their proper place.

The four stanzas that appeared in the "first manuscript copy" followed line 72. The first three were omitted by Gray; the fourth was rearranged and became the stanza that now begins, "Far from the madding crowd's ignoble strife. . . ." After quoting the four stanzas, Mason continues: "And here the poem was originally intended to conclude, before the happy idea of the hoary-headed Swain, &c. suggested itself to him." This statement is supported by two facts: first, that the poem at this point turns from reflection to narrative; and, second, that at this point the Fraser manuscript shows confusion, which indicates that Gray had had some difficulty in making the new

addition fit the original arrangement, for the twenty-fourth and twenty-fifth stanzas appear in the Fraser manuscript as five lines:

For thee, who mindful &c: as above
 If chance that e'er some pensive Spirit more,
 By sympathetic Musings here delay'd
 With vain, tho' kind, Enquiry shall explore
 Thy once-lov'd Haunt, this long deserted Shade
 (Haply some hoary-headed Swain shall say. . . .)

The six stanzas that precede the Epitaph were therefore probably the last to be written.⁶²

In conclusion, the evidence as regards composition seems to indicate the following possibilities: the Epitaph may have been written between 1742 and about 1746; the first eighteen stanzas may have been written about 1746, with the four rejected stanzas as a conclusion; the six stanzas preceding the Epitaph were almost certainly added between 1747 and 1750; and the six stanzas connecting the first eighteen and the last six may have been written intermediately. These are possibilities, and it is not the object of this article to urge that they are more: the object is to show that the foundation of the opinion that the *Elegy* was begun in 1742 is very weak, that there is possibly better reason for accepting Walpole's date of 1746, and that the only certain chronological fact concerning the *Elegy* in its manuscript state is that it dates as a finished poem from June 12, 1750, when Gray sent to Walpole a manuscript copy of it in its complete form.

III. IMPLICATIONS OF THE RELATIVE DATES OF COMPOSITION

It now remains to sum up the implications of the relative dates of composition, remembering that Shenstone's *Elegies* were mostly written between 1743 and 1749, and that Gray's *Elegy* was written between 1742 or 1746 and 1749, but can only be regarded as a complete poem from 1750.

First, Shenstone and Gray, almost contemporaneously and each possibly ignorant of what the other was doing, "moralized" the elegy,

⁶² The statement generally current in the nineteenth century that Gray took the *Elegy* in hand again in 1749 is without foundation in fact: the sole item of evidence for it is a conjecture made in 1814 by Mitford and accepted as fact by late nineteenth-century editors. Mitford records the death in 1749 of Gray's aunt, Mary Antrobus, and adds: "It is not improbable that this circumstance may have turned his thoughts towards finishing his 'Elegy,' which was commenced some time before" (*Works of Gray* [1814], p. xix). Gosse transforms this conjecture into fact: "In the winter of 1749 Gray took it in hand again, at Cambridge, after the death of his aunt, Mary Antrobus" (*Works of Gray* [1884], I, 72).

that is, made it a poem of moral reflection; and the importance of priority in this respect belongs to Shenstone.

Second, there is an unmistakable general resemblance in "moral cast" between Gray's *Elegy* and the *Elegies* of Shenstone, so much so that Richard Graves, as has been shown, thought it necessary to defend Shenstone from a possible charge of plagiarism by stating that the *Elegies* had been written long before the *Elegy* was published. There is further a very striking particular resemblance, in general theme and in particular sentiments, phrases, and words, between Gray's *Elegy* and Shenstone's Elegy XV: a comparison of the two would almost suggest that one poet had seen the other's verses. If so, Gray must have seen Shenstone's, because the evidence shows that Elegy XV was written probably about 1745.⁶³

Third, although Gray's *Elegy* appeared thirteen years before the *Elegies* of Shenstone, the latter poet's influence upon the elegy was at work much earlier than Gray's. The evidence shows that Shenstone's *Elegies* were in manuscript circulation for three years before Gray's *Elegy* was finished, let alone published; further, the elegies of Richard Jago, which themselves found imitators in the latter half of the century, were all written under Shenstone's influence before Gray's was finished.⁶⁴ The evidence shows also that during the thirteen years be-

⁶³ Gray nowhere mentions Hammond's *Love elegies*, but it is difficult to believe that he did not know them; it is possible, also, that the large number of people who had seen or heard of Shenstone's *Elegies* in manuscript included Gray. It seems significant that Mason, somewhere between 1747 and 1750, as has been shown, persuaded Gray to substitute the word "Elegy" for the word "Stanzas" in the title of the poem. Mason explains in his *Memoirs* that he did so because the subject of the poem authorized the change, because the meter seemed "peculiarly fit" for elegy, and because the example of "so capital a Poem" would appropriate the meter to the purposes of elegy in the future. He was one of those who insisted most strongly that an elegy should be written in the elegiac quatrain; indeed, he omits from his *Memoirs* of Gray a translation of an elegy of Tibullus, sent by West to Gray in a letter of December 22, 1736, partly, he says, because it is not his custom to insert translations, and partly "because it is not in alternate but heroic rhyme; which I think is not the species of English measure adapted to elegiac poetry. . . ." It seems certain, from what Mason says, that he at least had either read Hammond's *Love elegies*, or seen or heard of Shenstone's "manuscript book," or both. At any rate, if Gray's choice of meter was influenced by either Hammond or Shenstone, a date of 1742 for the beginning of the *Elegy* would obviously be impossible. It may at the same time be noted that Odell Shepard is wrong when, on the ground that Hammond's *Love elegies* were published in 1745, he dismisses Gosso's suggestion that they influenced Gray's choice of meter (see n. 57). The *Love elegies* were published late in 1742, with the date 1743 on the title-page (see n. 1).

⁶⁴ The first reference to Jago's elegies, which were published in Vols. IV (1755) and V (1758) of Dodsley's *Collection*, occurs in a letter of 1747 from Shenstone to Jago (Dodsley, *Letters of Shenstone* [1769], p. 140): they had evidently been submitted to Shenstone for comment and approval. Jago's "The blackbirds," "The linnets," "The goldfinches," and "The swallows" were all written before 1750, and made him known to the eighteenth cen-

tween 1751 and 1764, the respective dates of publication, Shenstone's *Elegies* were seen in manuscript by the numerous and often distinguished visitors to "The Leasowes": Akenside admired them; Spence was one of the many who suggested corrections for them; Percy and Grainger, both writers of elegy, saw them; Robert Dodsley, himself a poet, attempted for seven years to acquire them for publication; in other words, the *Elegies*, before publication, were for many years in what amounts to a state of publication. Evidence of Shenstone's direct influence upon later elegies is scanty, because where Gray's *Elegy* is a solitary masterpiece, and Hammond's *Love elegies* a series unified by their single theme, Shenstone's *Elegies* owe their originality, as Richard Graves pointed out, to their "extending this species of poetry to so great a variety of subjects."⁶⁵ They have all a moral cast, but are of many types: they include the love elegy, such as Elegy XXV; the pastoral elegy, such as Elegy XVIII; the funeral elegy, such as Elegy III; and the elegy which consists chiefly of reflective moralizing upon a locality, such as Elegy XV. In view of this variety, it is almost impossible to place one's finger on a definite elegy and say that it shows the influence of Shenstone.⁶⁶

Gray's influence admittedly was much greater than Shenstone's. It was immediate and immense, and justice can only be done to it in a subsequent article. Suffice it for this one to have shown that Shenstone nevertheless first "moralized" the eighteenth-century elegy, and that his influence upon it began earlier than Gray's; that Shenstone, a pioneer in the revival of poetic types and meters, also played a pioneer's part in the history of a type that was a characteristic creation of the eighteenth century.

VICTORIA COLLEGE, TORONTO

tury as the poet of the birds. In the *Gentleman's magazine* for September, 1782, for instance, a reviewer praises James Graeme's "The linnet: an elegy," and adds that "the praise of invention and the palm of merit in this species of elegy [is] chiefly due to Mr. Jago." The type was frequently imitated, for instance by Samuel Jackson Pratt, with his "The partridges: an elegy" (*Annual register* [1771], p. 241), and "Elegy of a nightingale" (*Gentleman's magazine* [1785], p. 386).

⁶⁵ Graves, p. 114.

⁶⁶ Two of Shenstone's elegiac types, however, are individual: Elegy VII is a vision, which became a favorite elegiac type later; and Elegy XXVI relates a tragic love-story, which also became a favorite type, possibly because of its similarity to the parallel ballad type. Two elegies which show Shenstone's direct influence may also be mentioned: *An elegy on the death of James Sutherland, Esq. By Eunohoo* (London, 1791), and Robert Lovell's "The wish. To a friend" (*Poems* [1795], of Lovell and Southey); these poems have each single lines borrowed from Elegies III and XII, respectively.

KEATS, DIODORUS SICULUS, AND RABELAIS¹

JOHN LIVINGSTON LOWES

IN BOOTH'S translation of Diodorus Siculus,² on a page the first line of which has to do with "Rhea the daughter of Coelus, sister of Saturn and the other Titans," and in the midst of a nest of passages referring to the *dramatis personae* of *Hyperion*,³ occurs the following paragraph (italics mine):

A gentle, cooling and *refreshing wind* pierces through the whole island, which makes the place exceeding *healthful*. . . . The first entrance into the island runs up a long *vale*, shaded all along with *high and lofty trees*, so thick, that only a dim and glimmering light passes through; but the *fiery beams of the sun* enter not in the least to offend the passenger. In passing along, *issue* many *sweet and chrystral springs*, so that the place is most pleasant and delightful. . . . When you are out of this *vale*, a pleasant and very large grotto . . . presents itself, arched over with an exceeding high and craggy rock. . . . Here are to be seen the many pleasant apartments of the *nymphs* . . . fit to

¹ Fourteen years ago, in 1922, in a paper read before the Modern Language Association of America, I offered what then seemed to me to be evidence of Keats's use of Diodorus Siculus and Rabelais. Later, when Miss Amy Lowell was at work on *John Keats*, I gave her my observations, with full permission to make use of them (*John Keats*, I, 425 ff.). The material which I had given her she characteristically made her own through first-hand investigation of its sources. Her use of it differed somewhat radically from mine, and her conclusions, which frequently go beyond my own, have more than once been called in question (see especially De Sélincourt, *The poems of John Keats* [5th ed.], p. 573). I have recently had occasion to come back to the problem, and it seems wise to restate briefly the case as I saw and still see it.

And now, since the lines above were written, Professor Claude Lee Finney, in his *Evolution of Keats's poetry* (1936), has quoted independently (I, 283), in a detailed discussion of the materials of the Bacchus lyric, a portion of the passage from Diodorus with which this paper opens. Miss Lowell (*John Keats*, I, 427-28) had related a fragment of that passage to *Endymion*, IV, 182-92. Professor Finney (I, 283) now relates the same fragment to *Endymion*, IV, 207. Whether or not either of the two bits of *Endymion* draws upon Diodorus (which I doubt), both Miss Lowell and Dr. Finney leave out of account by far the most significant parallel between Keats and the paragraph below, portions of which they both quote from Diodorus. In order that the evidence (such as it is) which first brought Diodorus and Rabelais into the game may be presented as a whole, rather than at intervals piecemeal, I belatedly print an article which was re-written, essentially as it stands, a decade ago.

² *The historical library of Diodorus the Sicilian*. . . . Translated by G. Booth, Esq. (London, 1814), I, 209. The folio of 1699 may, of course, have swum into Keats's ken. I shall, however, refer throughout to the reissue published less than four years before *Hyperion* was conceived (*Letters*, ed. Maurice Buxton Forman [1935], p. 82).

³ Eight pages earlier (p. 201) is a paragraph about Hyperion, Coelus, and Saturn; on p. 202 is a reference to Saturn and the Titans; and on p. 223—with a dozen more to Saturn and the Titans on the intervening pages—are references to Mnemosyne and Coelus.

receive even the gods themselves. Within all this pleasant round, is *not a flower or leaf to be seen withered, or in the least decayed.*

And here is the great opening paragraph of *Hyperion*:

Deep in the shady sadness of a *vale*
 Far sunken from the *healthy breath* of morn
 Far from the fiery noon,⁴ and eve's one star,
 Sat gray-hair'd Saturn, quiet as a stone,
 Still as the silence round about his lair;
Forest on forest hung about his head
 Like cloud on cloud. No stir of air was there,
 Not so much life as on a summer's day
 Robs not one light seed from the feather'd grass,
But where the dead leaf fell, there did it rest.
A stream went voiceless by, still deadened more
 By reason of his fallen divinity
 Spreading a shade: *the Naid* 'mid her reeds
 Press'd her cold finger closer to her lips.

Over and above the accord, in their respective settings, of the two passages as wholes, the correspondences in detail are too many and too close to be fortuitous: the “refreshing wind . . . which makes the place exceeding *healthful*,” the “*healthy breath* of morn”; the “*long vale, shaded*,” “*the shady sadness of a vale*”; the “*high and lofty trees*,” “*forest on forest*”; “*the fiery beams of the sun*,” which cannot pierce the trees, “*the fiery noon*,” which cannot reach the vale. In both there is the *stream*; in one are the *nymphs*, in the other the *Naid*. Even the dead leaf, which has given Keats his supreme imaginative touch, has its suggestion in Diodorus: “Not a . . . leaf to be seen withered, or in the least decayed.” There is complete change of key, to fit the poem’s mood, but the two vales are one. The landscape and its one Titanic central figure, permeated with utter stillness, remoteness, silence, majesty—that is Keats. But the hint to which his imagination responded with intense, creative energy he found, I think we may be sure, in Diodorus the Sicilian.

It is pertinent to say at once that a certain skepticism regarding Keats’s acquaintance with Diodorus is unwarranted. And quite apart from its bearing on the present point at issue, the place which Diodorus occupied in Keats’s day is of independent import. Keats could hardly,

⁴ “Fiery noon” is Chapman’s phrase, recalled from his *Iliad*, XI, 638.

indeed, have escaped *The historical library* had he tried. Had there been nothing else, Sandys's detailed and sometimes graphic references to Diodorus in the folio of 1640 which Keats used⁵ would almost inevitably have sent him to look up *The historical library*. Sandys explicitly refers to Diodorus as his authority in connection with Oceanus and Tethys (p. 22; cf. *Hyperion*, II, 75); with Bacchus in Nysa, "a Citie of Arabia the Happy" (p. 74); with offerings to Saturn (p. 118—misnumbered 120); with Proteus (p. 160); with racy accounts of Deianira and Busiris, on a page (172) which contains a translation of four lines from Seneca, beginning (somewhat startlingly) "O sorrow," and ending "She is too patient" (see n. 19 below); and with the *Corpos Santos* which appeared on the voyage of the Argonauts (pp. 216-17). But Keats ran across Diodorus everywhere. Lemprière refers to him under Bacchus (twice), the Titans, and *passim*. Davies, in his *Celtic researches*, which Keats owned and used,⁶ quotes (pp. 188-89) a long passage from Diodorus, and refers to him half-a-dozen times (pp. 181, 190, 193, 208, 551)—once (p. 208) in connection with the Titans, especially Iapetus and Cottus, Briareus and Gyges. Spelman, in *The expedition of Cyrus into Persia*, which Keats owned, refers in his "Short account of Xenophon" (2d ed. [1744], I, xxv), to Diodorus; remarks in his introduction on "the Character he has deservedly obtain'd for Fidelity, and Exactness" (p. xxix); and refers to him again on pages xxxii, xxxiii, and xxxv. Cooke, in his notes on Hesiod's *Theogony*,⁷ quotes (II, 74) Diodorus' account of the Nile; in his appended "Discourse on the theology and mythology of the antients" (pp. 93-97) translates from the first book of *The historical library* the account of Bacchus as Osiris; and (after a reference to the "stories of the Titans . . . and of Bacchus") summarizes part of book three. Preston, in his notes to the *Argonautics* of Apollonius Rhodius,⁸ refers to Diodorus in connection with Cybele ([1811], III, 77), and quotes two paragraphs from him concerning Aeolus (IV, 131). Whenever it

⁵ De Sélincourt, *Poems of John Keats*, pp. 391 and 505.

⁶ See the important note in De Sélincourt, p. 580.

⁷ *Works of Hesiod* (1811). "It is difficult to believe that he [Keats] did not read one of the translations of Hesiod's *Theogony*, well known at the end of the eighteenth century, e.g., that of Cooke, printed in Chalmers's *English Poets* (1810), Vol. 20, or that of Greene" (De Sélincourt, *Poems of John Keats*, p. 485).

⁸ For Keats's knowledge of Preston's translation see *TLS*, September 28, 1933 (No. 1652), p. 651.

was that Keats bought his *Auctores mythographi latini*, he would find, in the significant sixth note, "Ex Jove et Moneta" (I, 13), a reference to "Diodorus initio lib. IV." It is barely short of incredible that Keats, confronted at every turn by references to Diodorus the Sicilian, should not look up a rich and doubly accessible repository of "the beautiful mythology of Greece."

It is unnecessary, however, even apart from the lines of *Hyperion*, to rely on probability. On Saturday, February 14, 1818, Keats wrote to his brothers: "The Wednesday before last Shelley, Hunt and I wrote each a Sonnet on the River Nile" (*Letters* [ed. 1935], pp. 101-2).¹⁰ Keats and Shelley had been meeting each other for months (*ibid.*, pp. 26, 51, 88), and Shelley had long known *The historical library*, for as early as December, 1812, he had ordered, among other books, Diodorus Siculus, "original and translation."¹¹ And the octave of Shelley's sonnet is a tissue of recollections of the account of "The Nature of the River Nile" in the third chapter of Diodorus' first book. There is nothing in the two little *jeux d'esprit* to be harmed by the bald array of facts which follows.

In *The historical library* (I, 47) is the repeated statement that "the mountainous parts of Ethiopia . . . are soaked with continual rains," which fall "from the summer solstice to the equinox in autumn." On page 45 are the "cliffs [clefts] and hollow places," the water from which "occasions the river Nile to rise"—those "head-springs of the Nile," which "none can ever find out" (p. 46), its "spring-heads, hitherto unknown" (p. 37). On page 37 are "the vast deserts," which shut off the "spring-heads" of the Nile in *Ethiopia*. On page 44, again, "frost" and "parching heats" cause vapors which "fall upon the highest mountains," occasioning showers of rain which "cause the river to rise." On the same page is "the abundance of snow in the higher parts of *Ethiopia*," "the drifts and heaps of snow," "the melting snow." Still on the same page, "These vapours [“meteors”] . . . by the violent impression they make upon the tops of these mountains" cause "great storms" and it is through "this disorder of the air whirling about" (p. 47) that the

¹⁰ "The Wednesday before last" was February 4, and on February 5, with the sonnet in his mind, Keats signed himself in a letter to Haydon, "Your's like a Pyramid" (*Letters* [ed. 1935], p. 100).

¹¹ *Letters*, ed. Ingpen, I, 372; ed. Ingpen and Peck, IX, 36.

mountains are "soaked with continual rains, wherewith the river being filled, overflows." And Shelley wrote:

Month after month the gathered rains descend
 Drenching you secret Aethiopian dells,
 And from the desert's ice-girt pinnacles
 Where Frost and Heat in strange embraces blend
 On Atlas, fields of moist snow half depend.
 Girt there with blasts and meteors Tempest dwells
 By Nile's aerial urn,¹¹ with rapid spells
 Urging those waters to their mighty end.

The suggestion of the octave of Shelley's sonnet is unmistakable. And the Ozymandias sonnet, published in the *Examiner* in January, 1818, is based on the inscription in the next chapter (p. 53) of *The historical library*. There can be no question that on February 4, 1818, Shelley was drawing upon Diodorus as he wrote.

But so also, it is clear, was Keats. In the same third chapter of book one of *The historical library*, on page 40, is the graphic description of the *crocodile*,¹² on page 39 is the detailed account of "The Fruits of Egypt" (and see Miss Lowell, I, 572); on page 37 are "the vast deserts" of Ethiopia, and on page 35 "the deserts of Libya," both in immediate relation to the Nile; on page 35, too, ends the account of the "colonies" through which "the Egyptians say . . . many parts of the world were planted by their ancestors," as they also report (p. 18) "that at the beginning of the world"—the phrase is repeated fifteen lines later—"the first men were created in Egypt." On page 39, again, "the Nile . . . makes very rich Marches." "Pleasant" is Diodorus' stock adjective for Egypt: it is "the most pleasant country" (p. 35); on page 44 are "the pleasant woods" which adorn the mountains at its head. Moreover, the Nile "in its course . . . makes many islands" (p. 37).

¹¹ With the suggestions from Diodorus there are interwoven unmistakable reminiscences of James Thomson. For there can be no doubt that in this phrase Shelley was recalling Thomson's *Liberty*, Part III, ll. 252-53:

"To where the Nile from Aethiopian clouds,
 His never drained ethereal urn, descends."

Atlas, moreover, is described twenty-two lines earlier as "lodged Amid the restless clouds" (ll. 230-31); see also Thomson, *Summer*, l. 820: "From thundering steep to steep, he [Nile] pours his urn," with its context in ll. 792-802.

¹² On p. 89 is the account of the deification of the crocodile by King Menas, who "built a city, and called it *Crocodile* . . . where he built a sepulchre for himself with a four-square pyramid." And the great pyramids are described on pp. 65-67.

There are, indeed (p. 38), "so many islands made by this river, that it is scarcely credible." And Keats wrote in his sonnet:

Son of the old moon-mountains African!
 Chief of the *Pyramid and Crocodile!*
We call thee fruitful, and, that very while
A desert fills our seeing's inward span;
Nurse of swart nations since the world began
 . . . Thou dost bedew
Green rushes like our rivers, and dost taste
*The pleasant sunrise, green isles*¹³ *hast thou too,*
And to the sea as happily dost haste.

With the exception of but one of the phrases from Diodorus (p. 18) the material of the two sonnets falls within twelve pages (pp. 35-17) of a single chapter of *The historical library*. It is almost as if Keats and Shelley had turned immediately from a reading of Diodorus' detailed account of the Nile to the execution of their fifteen-minute¹⁴ *tours de force*. However that may be, the fact of Diodorus' influence is not open to question, and the evidence of the opening lines of *Hyperion* is corroborated by the witness of the sonnets. And there is still further confirmation.

One of the liveliest impressions which one carries away from *The historical library* is that of Osirian or Nysaeon Bacchus, and his wanderings and conquests. Four times—in Book I, chapters i and ii (pp. 22-33); in Book II, chapter iii (pp. 132-33—Bacchus as Osiris); in Book III, chapter iv (pp. 202-15); and especially in Book IV, chapter i (pp. 219-23)—the story is told, with graphic detail, through a total of thirty-two pages. And throughout the *History*, Bacchus is associated with the *Titans*.¹⁵ It is in a context rich in allusions to the *Titans* that Diodorus' description of the vale, as we have seen, occurs. But the vale is also at the heart of the fullest of Diodorus' four accounts of *Bacchus*. For the shaded vale, untouched by the fiery beams of the

¹³ Keats, too, was apparently recalling Thomson; see *Summer*, ll. 810-11 (again in the description of the Nile):

" . . . the fragrant isles

That with unfailing verdure smile around."

And in *Liberty*, III, 250, two lines before the account of Nile's "ethereal urn" is the phrase "a verdant isle."

¹⁴ Woodhouse, *Poems*, II; see De Selincourt, p. 587 (addenda).

¹⁵ "The Egyptians . . . say that Milampodes brought into Greece the rites and solemnities of Bacchus, and the fabulous story of Saturn and the Titans" (p. 96); and see pp. 33, 201-3, 211-15 (his war with the Titans), 223.

sun, was in fact, in the words of the chapter heading, "the Grotto in Nysa where [Bacchus] was brought up."¹⁶ It was through a perfectly logical association that the opening lines of Keats's epic of the Titans drew their inspiration from an account of Bacchus.

It is clear, moreover, that *Hyperion* was in Keats's mind when the fourth book of *Endymion* was written. The letter to Haydon on January 23, 1818,¹⁷ is conclusive, as is *Endymion*, IV, 774: "Thy lute-voic'd brother will I sing ere long."¹⁸ The "Sorrow roundelay"¹⁹ is quoted, in letters to Miss Reynolds and Bailey respectively, on October 31 and November 5, 1817.²⁰ And the roundelay flows into the superb Triumph of Bacchus. Bacchus and the Titans, at the close of 1817 and early in 1818, were beyond question together occupying Keats's mind. Once more, it is not strange that the opening lines of *Hyperion* should have their *fons et origo* in an account of Bacchus.

Now it may be said at once that for almost all the details of the Triumph of Bacchus in *Endymion* Keats could have drawn upon recollections of half-a-dozen books which he had read. Godwin and Lemprière would have given him Silenus, and Silenus is riding on an ass in Sandys. Egypt, Ethiopia (Abyssinia), and Arabia are together in Godwin, and India is in Spence and in Keats's own volume of Potter's *Antiquities*. The tigers are in Lemprière, Spence, Sandys, and Potter; the lions in Potter and Lemprière; the panther's skin in Sandys (p. 61) and Lemprière; elephants (but attached to the chariot) in Spence; Osiris in Godwin and Lemprière; the cymbals in Lemprière; the "darts wrapped round with ivy" are in Godwin. And the satyrs and maenads

¹⁶ Sandys's long note on Bacchus (p. 74) would with little question have sent Keats to the passage had nothing else done so. For Sandys begins his relation with a reference to Diodorus' striking account of "Nysa, a Cittie of Arabia the Happy, where first he was concealed from the inquisition of Juno" (see *The historical library*, I, 127). And that account was a turn of the page from the description of the vale. It was Sandys, too, upon whom Keats was drawing, as his own notes in the Woodhouse MS disclose (De Sélincourt, p. 505), for information about the Titans.

¹⁷ *Letters* (ed. 1935), p. 82. On November 22, 1817, Keats had quoted *Endymion*, IV, 581-90 (*Letters*, ed. 1935, p. 66), and he was then at work on the copying and revision of the poem (*Letters*, ed. 1935, pp. 82, 86, 87, etc.).

¹⁸ See also the references to "Titan's foe" (IV, 943), and "old Saturnus' forelock" (IV, 956). And cf. II, 993-94: "more unsee than Saturn in his exile."

¹⁹ *Endymion*, IV, 146 ff. With "O Sorrow . . . But ah! she is too constant and too kind" (the original reading), cf. p. 297 above. The repeated "too" was later changed to "so."

²⁰ *Letters* (ed. 1935), pp. 58 and 62.

are everywhere. Nearly all the facts, in a word, were in the compendiums, and from those handy epitomes some of them, doubtless, came back to Keats's memory.

But in the handbooks they were dead; in *The historical library* they live. It is not the recollections of bald disjointed facts, but the imaginative molding of an impression in its totality, which underlies the poem. Only the reading of Diodorus' four narratives themselves—once granted Keats's knowledge of them—will bring home the reason for a breadth and sweep in the Triumph as far from Tooke and Lemière and Sandys and Potter as the sea is from a millpond.

One reason—but not, I feel sure, the only one. Diodorus, like Sandys and the handbook-makers, wholly lacks something which, in supreme degree, the lyric has—a vividness of sheer visualizing energy, a tumultuousness of movement, an almost barbaric richness, as of the gorgeous East itself, which are unequaled anywhere else in Keats. They are Keats, to be sure, but they suggest that something had stirred his imagination to unwonted fire, while at the same time it enriched his store of lively imagery. And precisely that apparently happened.

Keats had among his books, as we know from Woodhouse's list, a copy of Rabelais in French. His letters at this period show that he was reading Voltaire²¹—in early 1819, at least, in French. In September, 1818, he was translating a sonnet of Ronsard,²² and he may well have read his Rabelais in the original. But whether in French or in English, the probability that he would have read him—if only, in Petrarchan fashion, the beginning and the end—is overwhelming.

The goal of the great voyage which begins with Rabelais' fourth book was the Oracle of the Bottle. The fifth book ends with the enviable visit to the Temple of the Holy Bottle. And in the temple were two mosaics (chaps. xxxix and xl)—one of “Bacchus's Army drawn up in Battalia,” the other of “the Battle in which the good Bacchus overthrew the Indians,” which ends with “the representation of his triumph.” And they are described with incomparable vividness and energy. “It would have been much more like [Keats],” says Sir Sidney

²¹ *Letters* (ed. 1935), pp. 107 (February 21, 1818) and 334 (April, 1819).

²² *Ibid.*, pp. 216 and 218.

Colvin, dismissing from consideration as influences Godwin's *Pantheon* and Spence's *Polymetis*, "to work from something seen with his eyes."²³ And nobody can read the delineation of the two mosaics without seeing them, or, having seen them, can forget them. They are conceived and depicted with a boundless gusto which pours them along to the eye in a torrent of marching, dancing, capering, singing, shouting forms. Heraclitus might have summed them up in his *πάντα ρεῖ*—the whole thronging spectacle *flows*, in a tumult of motion and sound. Turn Rabelais into Keats and you have the sweeping, untrammelled movement of the lyric.

That thronging movement, if I am right, was Rabelais' essential contribution to the poem. But over and above the familiar details—the satyrs and maenads, Silenus on his ass, the ivy, the tigers, Osiris, Egypt and India—there are particulars common to Keats and Rabelais which are not in Diodorus or Sandys or the handbooks. In *Endymion*, "Onward the tiger and the *leopard* pants, with Asian *elephants*." Tigers are present in Sandys, Lemière, Godwin, Spence, and Potter—only in Lemière drawing the chariot; in Rabelais alone (chaps. xxxix and xl) the chariot is drawn, as in *Endymion*, by *leopards* and by *elephants*. Bacchus' crew hunt about the wilds "*on spleenful unicorn*"—a far from obvious mount. Only a dozen pages earlier, in his thirtieth chapter, Rabelais remarks, after stating that he had seen "two and thirty Unicorns," that "they are a *curst* sort of Creatures, *much resembling a fine Horse*." In *Endymion*, "*The Kings of Inde* their jewel-sceptres vail"; in Rabelais (chap. xl) "*The Indian Kings*" were bound to the chariot. Rabelais' Bacchus, in his chariot, "was seen, drinking out of a mighty Urn" (chap. xl); in *Endymion*, as Bacchus stood within his car, the wine was running down his arms. And there are other parallels.²⁴

²³ *John Keats*, p. 231.

²⁴ I suspect that the hint for the "plump infant laughers," mounted on the "scaly backs" of crocodiles—"its skin is carved all over with scales," says Diodorus of the crocodile, in the chapter on which Keats drew in the sonnet "To the Nile" (p. 299, above)—may have come from the account, in Rabelais' next chapter, of "the lively and pleasant Battle of naked Boys, mounted on little Hobby-horses." And it is at least possible that the maenads' cry, "We follow Bacchus! *Bacchus on the wing!*" recalls the striking passage in Rabelais' fourth book, which Miss Lowell quotes in *John Keats*, I, 432-33. The suggestion, which was (and is) highly tentative, harks back (as Miss Lowell made clear) to me. But in view of the phrase's stock sense of "on the move," which here needs no external suggestion, it cannot be regarded as "prov[ing] conclusively that Keats had Rabelais in mind."

Correspondences in detail lend weight to the agreement in pulsing life and movement between the poem and Rabelais' graphic prose. And it is hard to believe that Keats, possessing a book which contained the most gorgeously visualized of all accounts of Bacchus and his triumph, would either fail to read it, or, having read it, remain uninfluenced when he came to write.

That is the case, as I see it, for the inclusion of Diodorus Siculus among the influences which stirred Keats's imagination in at least two great passages, and, in one of them, of Rabelais as well.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

REVIEW ARTICLE

NEW ATTRIBUTIONS TO POPE¹

THE volume here under consideration is an edition of a rare miscellany which first appeared in 1717 as *Poems on several occasions*. Mr. Ault's introduction is chiefly taken up with the discussion of Pope's editorial connection with the book, and with arguments to support the attribution of all but five of its forty-two anonymous poems to Pope. Since, as Mr. Ault points out, it was I who first called attention to the miscellany, asserted that Pope was its editor, and ascribed to him fifteen of these anonymous poems,² it seems to be incumbent upon me to review Mr. Ault's conclusions.

On many things Mr. Ault and I are in complete agreement. He accepts and supplements my argument that Pope's editorship is indicated by the large number of his friends among the contributors, by his own contributions, and by the frequency with which his work is praised in the miscellany. Mr. Ault further agrees with my ascription of fifteen of the anonymous poems to Pope, though he demurs at my reasons in one or two instances. Finally, he adopts my suggestion that various puzzling references to the miscellany in the later eighteenth and the twentieth centuries are due to the confusion of the book with Fenton's poems, which were issued by the same publisher in the same year. The striking difference between my conclusions and those of Mr. Ault is that he ascribes to Pope twenty-two additional poems, resting his case chiefly on parallels of thought and diction in these poems and in the acknowledged works of Pope.

To be convincing, parallels should be, like Sam Weller's knowledge of London, "extensive and peculiar." And even when a number of such parallels have been assembled, one must inquire whether their presence can be explained in any other way than by the assumption of common authorship. Have the parallels a common source in the work of a third writer? Are they, if they occur in a translation, directly derived from the text translated? Can they be explained as borrowings by or from the author to whom it is desired to ascribe them? Lastly, and very pertinently in the present case, can they be the result of editorial emendation?

Several of Mr. Ault's parallels fail when they are subjected to the tests suggested by the first two questions. "Smit with . . . ,"³ at the beginning of the line "Smit with thy lays, we join'd the Sylvan throng," is obviously an

¹ *Pope's own miscellany*, ed. Norman Ault (London: Nonesuch Press, 1935). Pp. xcvi + 165.

² *London mercury*, X (1924), 614-23, and XI (1925), 411, 412. Four of these fifteen were already included in the canon.

echo of Milton's "Smit with the love of sacred song" (*PL*, III, 29). And if one requires a source for such a passage as

Now of her thoughts thou art the constant theme,
By day her whole desire, at night her dream,

surely Dryden's

Aeneas is my thoughts' perpetual theme,
Their daily longing and their nightly dream,

[*Dido to Aeneas*, ll. 27-28]

s closer than any of the parallels in Pope's works cited by Mr. Ault. In discussing the translation of an epigram from Claudian Mr. Ault notes a "conception of coldness being preserved amidst and in spite of surrounding heat, literally and metaphorically," and he finds the same conception in a passage from Pope's *Iliad*. In both instances the concept is present in the original passage from which the translation was made. Of another set of parallels Mr. Ault says:

. . . they state a moral problem which seems to have been almost an obsession with Pope, for not only has he treated it at full length in *Eloisa to Abelard*, but has summarized it again and again in such lines as:

Is it, in heav'n, a crime to love too well?

[*Unfortunate Lady*, 6]

Too soon they taught me 'twas no sin to love.

[*Eloisa to Abelard*, 68]

Alas, alas, that ever Love was sin!

[*Wife of Bath*, 324]

The last two of these three quotations are derived directly from the originals which Pope was paraphrasing at the time—the last, in fact, is copied verbatim from its source.

But the largest number of the parallels which I find unconvincing fail because they do not pass the tests of extensiveness and peculiarity. Generally speaking, the less extensive the phrase, the more necessary it becomes that its components should themselves be unusual: single words, in fact, must be almost *hapax legomena* to carry any weight, and even then they must be suspect if there is a possibility of direct quotation by the second user. Since it is obviously impracticable to discuss all Mr. Ault's suggested parallels in an article such as this, I have selected several which seem to me to be representative, beginning with single words and passing to more extended examples.

The appearance in two anonymous poems of the word "unperforming," which Mr. Ault has found once in Pope's correspondence and also in an unspecified place or places in his acknowledged verse, does not seem to me to carry much weight. The *OED* shows Dryden using the word in one of his well-known poems, and Watts employing it in his *Horae lyricae* (1706) in the very same way (his phrase is "unperforming promises") as it is used in the poems

we are considering. Again, Mr. Ault finds that in two of the anonymous poems there are lines beginning "Sure . . ." or "And sure . . .," in which the word "sure" is used adverbially. He regards these lines as evidential because he has found some fifty lines in Pope's acknowledged verse which begin in a similar way. In other words, this supposedly characteristic opening is employed by Pope less frequently than once in a thousand lines. On the other hand, it occurs twice in Gay's *Shepherd's week*, a poem of less than nine hundred lines. Three of the poems in the miscellany begin, "See how . . ."; one of these is certainly the work of Pope, and Mr. Ault offers the opening as evidence of common authorship. But Mr. W. N. H. Harding's index of song-books³ lists over fifty songs published between 1650 and 1715 which begin in this manner. Again, Mr. Ault submits the phrases "unerring eyes" and "the glories of her eyes" as peculiar to Pope. The first of these may be found in Vanbrugh's "To a lady more cruel than fair." Of the second it may be observed that the connection of glory with a lady's eyes is one of the most hackneyed of Augustan commonplaces. It appears four times, for example, within fifty pages of the sixth volume of the 1716 edition of Dryden's miscellany,⁴ and the exact phrase relied upon by Mr. Ault occurs in Sackville's "Oh, why did e'er my thoughts aspire" (1684), and as "the glories of your eyes" in a piece in the second edition of *Female poems . . . by Ephelia* (1682). Doubtless these are not the only instances. Lastly, to give one more example, Mr. Ault cites the locution "peculiar care," which he has found seven times in the acknowledged works of Pope, twice preceded by "God's" and once by "Heav'n's." Even these three-word combinations, I imagine, will not sound unfamiliar to the readers of Augustan verse; at all events, in reading through the first half of the sixth volume of the 1716 edition of Dryden's miscellany I found "God's peculiar care" on page 123 and "Heav'n's peculiar care" on page 190.

In examining the diction of the poem which he is most anxious to prove Pope's, Mr. Ault employs an unusual extension of the argument from parallels:

First, then, as to vocabulary: there being no complete concordance to Pope's works in existence (for E. Abbott's compilation excludes the 'Homer' and other translations and poems amounting to considerably more than half the verse, besides the whole of the prose), it is impossible to say offhand that such and such a word was, or was not, used by Pope. A protracted search, however, enables me to state that every word in this lengthy panegyric occurs also in Pope's works, with the possible exception of 'banter' and 'swerve,' and these, too, I believe I encountered somewhere in the prose and forgot at the moment to note. Admittedly the majority of the words, together with these two, belong to the poetic diction of the period. Nevertheless, every writer has, within the contemporary usage, his own characteristic range, which in addition, frequently contains a few expressions more

³ In MS, in the possession of its compiler in Chicago.

⁴ Pp. 233, 236, 246, and 282.

or less peculiar to himself. If, therefore, this poem were written by another person, we should legitimately expect him to employ in the course of fifty-five lines of verse a larger proportion of words outside Pope's vocabulary than might be represented by these two questionable, and not at all uncommon, aliens. For which reason, and also because most of the words recur again and again in Pope's poems, we cannot avoid the conclusion that, so far as vocabulary is concerned, his authorship of the piece is not only possible but probable.

In order to test the value of this method of determining authorship I applied it to another and considerably longer poem in the miscellany—an elegy upon Thomas Rowe. In Abbott's concordance alone I found all but five of the words employed ("uncertain," "engagement," "resemblance," "impression," "elegance"); the last three of these I discovered, without a protracted search, in the postscript to the *Odyssey*, and in the interval between the writing of this review and its printing, I have come upon the remaining two words in Pope's early correspondence. We have, then, a poem of ninety-seven lines, every word of which occurs somewhere in Pope's works, to oppose to a poem of fifty-five lines containing two "questionable" words. The longer poem was written by Thomas Rowe's wife, Elizabeth Singer. Further comment on the value of the "vocabulary test" seems unnecessary.

Mr. Ault does not, of course, confine himself to the argument from parallels in dealing with the anonymous poems, but in many instances his supplementary arguments leave me still unconvinced. The technical terms concerning painting which appear in "On a picture of Mrs. Catherine L——," for example, do not seem to me uncharacteristic of either Gay or Prior, to mention only two contemporaries of Pope who were interested in art. And the ten reasons offered by Mr. Ault to show that Pope wrote "The old gentry" suggest to me an equal number of adequate replies. I should like, however, to pass to the consideration of a series of seven poems which occupies pages 108-16 of Mr. Ault's reprint of the miscellany. In attributing these poems to Pope, Mr. Ault ignores some significant internal evidence which is, in my opinion, extremely damaging to his case. One of these poems is addressed to "the Ld. L——n," whom Mr. Ault identifies (quite rightly, I think) as Lord Lansdown. The poem deals with a cruel mistress named Aurelia; its first four stanzas read:

Where L——n woud'st thou have me go?
To whom shou'd I complain?
You've seen the eyes that cause my woe,
And know her hearts disdain.

Thy Muse (and all confess her power)
Cou'd scarce the Mother move,
Tho' oft she watcht th' unguarded hour
To soften her to love.

Will the severer Daughter's ear
Then listen to my lyre?
Or deign the wretched youth to hear
She only cou'd inspire?

Yet my *Aurelia!* do not boast
Thy fated lover's lot;
In thine, thy mother's charms are lost,
Her triumphs all forgot. . . .

The plain implication of these lines is that Aurelia is the daughter of Lansdown's famous cruel mistress, Myra. The last two stanzas of the poem indicate that Aurelia was not engaged to be married. A subsequent poem in the series, "The King's box to Aurelia," must be dated 1714 or later, if the king referred to is George I. And the poem immediately following this gives still more information about Aurelia:

In her own isle the Goddess lay,
Fenc'd from the sun's severer ray;

How blest the world, how eas'd of care,
Had but her Isle detain'd her there,
Thousands and thousands had been free,
That sigh and languish now with me.

With me, their fable once, they prove
Companions now in hapless love

And yet I warn'd them of their fate,
Shew'd 'em what wounds her eyes create,
Describ'd her arm'd at every part,
And caution'd 'em to shun the dart. . . .

The statement that Aurelia was "fenc'd from the sun's severer ray" in "her own Isle" suggests that the isle was Ireland. If this is so, the meaning of the foregoing lines is that their author met Aurelia in Ireland, that he returned to England and warned the English of the power of her charms, and that she herself has now come to England, where her triumphs are proving the poet a true prophet. This interpretation seems to be entirely consistent with such facts as I have been able to discover about the two daughters of Lansdown's Myra, who in real life was Frances Brudenell. The elder daughter, born in 1694, was the posthumous child of the second Earl of Newburgh, whom she succeeded as Countess in her own right. The younger daughter was Dorothea Bellew, born, in 1696, of Myra's marriage with Lord Bellew, an Irish peer. I have not been able to determine which of the two daughters (if either) was Aurelia, or when either of them visited England. The elder was married in 1713, the younger in 1717, but as the poems need not all have been written at the same time these dates do not help us much. Neither does the fact that

Lansdown is addressed by his title (acquired in 1712), since the substitution in the verse of "Lansdown" for the family name "Granville" would have been the simplest of editorial emendations. The reference to "the king" is some ground for conjecture that at least one of the poems was composed as late as 1714. But in any event it is unlikely, having due regard for the ages of Myra's daughters, that any of the poems was written before 1710. This fact would dispose of Mr. Ault's identification of this series of poems as the products of Pope's "childhood" of which the poet speaks in his letter to Cromwell on August 21, 1710.⁵ Moreover, there does not appear to be any record of an acquaintance, let alone an affair of the heart, between Pope and either of the suggested Aurelias, though such an acquaintance, if it ever existed, must have come about during the period following Pope's entrance into the world of literary London, where such a matter would certainly have excited comment. Finally, if I am right in my conjecture that the author of this series of poems had met Aurelia in Ireland, then he cannot possibly have been Pope.

Before entering upon the examination of one last poem I should like to discuss a general argument advanced by Mr. Ault: that it is inconceivable that Pope would have printed in this miscellany of his anything written by another poet who had either stolen his phrases or imitated his style, and that he would have hotly resented as plagiarisms parallels appearing in anyone else's verse. In making this generalization Mr. Ault is perhaps thinking of Pope's attacks on James Moore-Smythe for his use in *The rival modes* of six lines by Pope. These lines, however, were appropriated before Pope had published them. That Pope was complaisant about imitations of and borrowings from his published verse is made clear by his inclusion in the 1717 miscellany of Broome's paraphrase of the forty-third chapter of Ecclesiasticus, which is plainly modeled upon Pope's *Messiah*, and which contains recognizable echoes of that poem and of others by Pope. I quote some of the most obvious:

The everlasting mountains melt away	[l. 11]
Rocks fall to dust, and mountains melt away	[<i>Messiah</i> , l. 106]
Pours o'er the world a flood of radiant light	[l. 16]
And on the sightless eyeball pour the day	[<i>Messiah</i> , l. 40]
The fragrant infants [flowers] paint th' enamel'd vales	[l. 25]
Here blushing Flora paints th' enamell'd ground	[<i>Windsor Forest</i> , l. 38]
Oft waves on waves in solid mountains rise,	
And <i>Alpes</i> of ice invade the wondring skies	[l. 89-90]
New scenes unfold, and worlds on worlds arise	[l. 128]
Hills peep o'er hills, and Alps on Alps arise!	
[<i>Essay on criticism</i> , II, 132]	

⁵ As a matter of fact, the letter clearly identifies these "childhood" poems as the imitations of Waller.

When the seas rage, and loud the ocean roars,
And foamy billows lash the sounding shores: [ll. 97-98]

But when loud surges lash the sounding shore,
The hoarse, rough verse should like the torrent roar.

[*Essay on criticism*, II, 168-69]

Broome's attempt to imitate Pope's style throughout the poem is, in fact, so marked that one wonders if it may not have been one of the factors which led Pope to invite his collaboration in the translating of Homer. Certainly the appearance of Broome's paraphrase in this miscellany disposes of the suggestion that Pope would not countenance imitations of his manner or borrowings from his published works.

With this introduction let me turn to the examination of "To Mr. Pope on his translation of Homer." Mr. Ault lays particular emphasis upon his ascription of this poem to Pope, because he regards it as the fundamental cause of Pope's concealment of his connection with the miscellany. I may say at once that I should be quite willing to assent to a suggestion that Pope *might* have written this poem, although I must confess that, if it were proved that he did write it, the fact would not "throw a deepening shade on his character" in my estimation, as it would in Mr. Ault's. The practice of puffing was too general in the eighteenth century to carry any serious moral stigma. I am quite ready to agree that the man who had already written the fortieth number of the *Guardian* might well have repeated his performance, although I think he would have done a better job than this particular eulogy. Mr. Ault, too, finds the poem below Pope's standards, but he explains this falling-off as the result of Pope's attempt to conceal his own style. This is also the explanation advanced for the scarcity of parallels in the poem—a scarcity which Mr. Ault endeavors to counterbalance by an examination of the vocabulary of the poem as a whole. I have already discussed the fallacy (as I see it) underlying this argument. I should like in this instance to apply another test to Mr. Ault's methods of proof. I should like to see whether it is not possible, using means adopted by Mr. Ault, to make an equally good case for some person other than Pope as the author of the eulogy. If this can be done, then Pope's authorship has certainly not been definitely established.

John Hughes, in 1714, addressed complimentary verses to Pope on the occasion of the proposals for the translation of the *Iliad*. In Hughes's poem we find the line, "Crown'd on thy Windsor's plains with early bays," which suggests the second line of the anonymous poem we are considering, "Sung Windsor's forests, and her flow'ry plains." I have not the familiarity with the works of Hughes which would be necessary if I were to make an exhaustive search for parallels, but I have gone through his poems rapidly with an eye open merely for those phrases in the anonymous poem which Mr. Ault cites as characteristic of Pope. The first of these is "Sure" (or "And sure" or "But sure") used adverbially at the beginning of a line—a locution which I have

previously discussed. One line of the anonymous eulogy begins thus; I have noted four similar lines in the work of Hughes. Another line of the eulogy begins, "You, only you" Mr. Ault finds, in the range of Pope's verse, fourteen lines beginning in some such way (e.g., "Thou, only thou" and "Death, only death"), and he has not encountered similar openings elsewhere. Hughes has "Gain, pow'ful gain" and "Now, e'en now" to indicate that the device of repetition for emphasis was not foreign to his style. I have not found the phrase "Smit with" (which, as I have pointed out, is an echo of Milton, not of Pope) in Hughes's acknowledged poems, but it would be quite natural for him to use it, as he was one of the most enthusiastic Augustan admirers of Milton.⁶

It need hardly be pointed out that the pedestrian character of the eulogy, which is an obstacle to its attribution to Pope, is rather helpful than otherwise to anyone who ascribes it to Hughes. But there is a much more striking argument in favor of Hughes. Pope, in editing the miscellany, tended toward a policy of grouping poems by a common author. The eulogy we are examining was printed between "The old gentry" (which Mr. Ault assigns to Pope, but which I believe to have been written by Prior) and "To a lady with the tragedy of Cato," which is printed anonymously, but which was written, as Mr. Ault points out, by John Hughes. Mr. Ault offers no explanation of the suppression of Hughes's name, but it is now easy to suggest a plausible one. Hughes was a member of the group at Button's, which depended upon Addison for the distribution of Whig patronage. He would not have liked to appear publicly as an admirer of Pope's *Homer* after the Pope-Tickell imbroglio, even if he mitigated his offense by flattering Addison in the next breath. The safest course, naturally, would have been to avoid having his name connected with either eulogy by allowing both to be printed anonymously.

I hope that no one will conclude from all this that I believe Hughes has been proved the author of "To Mr. Pope." I merely wish to record as forcibly as I can my conviction that no sound conclusions on questions of authorship can be reached by these means.

Perhaps it will be well for me, in closing, to state my present beliefs about the authorship of the anonymous poems in the miscellany. I consider that the twelve poems beginning with the imitations of Waller are definitely proved to be Pope's because, as I said in 1924, they are printed as compositions by the same hand, and Pope later printed two of them as his own.⁷ I feel that I

⁶These are the phrases which Mr. Ault selects as "most striking." He adds two other groups of parallels which I have not bothered to search for. The first set consists of references by the author to the particular poems of Pope which he is praising—references which, as Mr. Ault admits, would have been natural if the eulogist had been someone else than Pope. The other set of parallels consists of four "approximations of word or idea" added as a sort of makeweight.

⁷Despite Mr. Ault's disagreement, I must adhere to my original statement that these twelve poems are printed as the work of one hand. The group begins with the heading, "Verses in imitation of Waller. By a youth of thirteen." Six poems follow without further

should qualify my original positive ascription to Pope of the translation from Maynard; however, the unusual phrasing of the subtitle ("In English for Sir W. Trumbull"), the juxtaposition of this poem with another which Pope wrote and permitted Trumbull to appropriate, and the other circumstances set forth in my article, make the attribution extremely plausible. Mr. Ault seems to me to make an equally good, if not a better case for Pope's authorship of "The monster of Ragusa," from evidence contained in the correspondence of Pope and Swift. Aside from this I think Mr. Ault makes his best cases for the pastoral, "Palaemon," and for the group of four poems near the end of the miscellany, beginning with the lines on the statue of Cleopatra. Here he cites the only parallels which I regard as really significant; it is interesting to compare them with those he adduces elsewhere. I should be even more deeply impressed than I am by his arguments about these five poems were it not for Pope's habit of emending freely the verses of friends or acquaintances which were submitted to him—a habit which Mr. Ault stresses, apparently without realizing the extent to which it jeopardizes his contentions in general. Were it not for this habit I should regard as conclusive the parallel between "Palaemon" and a manuscript passage in "Winter" which Pope never published. As it is, I think that these poems must for the present be classified as possibly by Pope. I cannot feel that anything has been proved with regard to the remaining poems which Mr. Ault attributes for the first time to Pope. I should like to believe that some of them are Pope's, but the better they are, the less likely it seems to me that Pope, if he had written them, would have excluded them from his collected poems of 1717 or of later years. Some of them suggest, more or less strongly, that they may have been the work of this or that poet other than Pope. The problems they raise call for further study. We should be grateful to Mr. Ault for making them generally accessible, and for saying all that could be said, on the grounds of internal evidence, in favor of Pope's authorship.

ARTHUR E. CASE

Northwestern University

indication of authorship. Next comes a heading, "Verses in imitation of Cowley. By the same hand." Five poems follow: "Weeping," "Presenting a lark," "The river," "The fourth ode of Catullus. Paraphrased in the manner of Cowley," and "Catullus. Ad peninsulam Sirmionem." As in the case of the imitations of Waller, there is no additional indication of the authorship of the individual poems. Last comes the twelfth poem of the group: "Lydia imitated from the lyric of Corn. Gallus. By the same hand." I can see but one reasonable interpretation of these facts.

It should perhaps be stated that the indentations of the titles in the table of contents, as printed by Mr. Ault, appear to be editorial emendations based upon his own theories; at all events, the indentations do not appear in any of the three original copies of the miscellany which I have examined.

Bo

ser
lar
cat
He
of
det
scr
ple
the
Ina
dis
his
nif
sci
of
th
th
to
[A
II
fu
fr
in
of
wa
pu

ly
sp
B
an
[1
m

BOOK REVIEWS

Books known to Anglo-Latin writers from Aldhelm to Alcuin (670-804). By J. D. A. OGILVY. Cambridge: Mediaeval Academy of America, 1936. Pp. xix+109.

The author of this Mediaeval Academy monograph has performed a real service in attempting this laborious task. He has identified an extraordinarily large number of older sources in Anglo-Latin writers, and has shown great caution in distinguishing between actual borrowings and chance resemblances. He has avoided the pitfall of regarding a citation of a Latin author as proof of knowledge of that author, and has rejected many quotations that were derived from a secondary source, especially from the grammarians. Manuscripts written in the Insular script are cited (though the list is far from complete) as possible evidence for an English origin of the text they contain, but the possibility is recognized that they may have been transcribed in some Insular center on the Continent. Evidence of this sort can in some cases be discounted at once; e.g., the fact that the Bamberg codex of the *Scriptores historiae Augustae* (p. 79) is written in the Anglo-Saxon script is without significance, for it was copied, presumably at Fulda, from a ninth-century manuscript (Vat. Pal. 899), which was probably written at the German monastery of Lorsch. A paleographical or philological study of the manuscripts will often throw light on the history of the text; e.g., Alcuin prefixed a dedicatory poem to the text of the Alexander-Dindimus correspondence (p. 5), which he presented to Charlemagne. Ogilvy comments: "I have no reason to suppose that he [Alcuin] got it from England," but Traube (*Vorlesungen und Abhandlungen*, III, 113) pointed out that the text contains certain errors caused by the confusion of Insular letter-forms and concluded that Alcuin had his manuscript from England. Similarly, the text of *Apollonius of Tyre* (p. 11) shows Insular influence. A possible contact with England is suggested by our oldest codex of the romance. This is a tenth-century copy of an Insular manuscript which was connected with Cellanus, the Irish bishop of Perrona (ca. 675), who was a pupil of Aldhelm. Cellanus may well have obtained his copy from England.

Omissions are inevitable in dealing with authors who operated so extensively with scissors and paste-pot as did the Anglo-Saxon Latin writers. Only a specialist can do justice to a writer like Bede. Ogilvy could have increased his Bede citations had he been familiar with Laistner's article, "Bede as a classical and a patristic scholar" (*Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, XVI [1933], 69-94). Laistner shows that Bede used Jerome's translation of Didymus' *De spiritu sancto*, Jerome's long-lost commentary on the Psalms (first

published in 1895), Gregory of Nazianzus from the Latin translation of Rufinus, Cyprian's *Liber testimoniorum*, Avitus of Brace, Ambrosius' *De spiritu sancto* and *De Noe et arca*, and Philip's commentary on Job; the most interesting discovery, made by his pupil, C. W. Jones, is that Bede used Vegetius in several of his works. The most serious omissions involve grammatical texts, in which we know the Anglo-Saxons were much interested, chiefly the grammars of Boniface and Tatuin. Boniface, in a prefatory letter to his *Ars grammatica*, addressed to a certain Sigebert, gives a list of his sources: Donatus, Priscianus, Romanus (whom he knew only through Charisius), Veleius Longus, Probus, Audax, Flavianus (i.e., Charisius), Victorinus, Focas, Asporius (Asper), and Pompeius. Of these Ogilvy cites only Donatus, Probus, Audax, and Charisius. He might be excused for overlooking this list since the letter is not attached to the *Ars* in the edition published by Mai (*Classici auctores*, VII [1835], 575 ff.). It is found, however, in two Paris manuscripts, in one of which it precedes the *Ars* of Boniface, in the other that of Tatuin. It was discussed by Manitius (*Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters*, I, 459-61), who unfortunately failed to recognize these texts as works of Boniface and Tatuin—he considered the letter a French product. I identified the texts in 1928, but it remained for the German scholar Fickermann to publish the facts (*Neues Archiv*, XLIX [1932], 763, and L [1933], 210). The only authors cited by Ogilvy for Tatuin are Donatus and Pompeius; a full list would include Asper, Consentius, Eutyches, Priscian (the rare work *De nomine, pronomine et verbo*, not the great *Institutiones*), Sergius, and Servius (I am indebted for this list to Miss Susan Cobbs of Randolph-Macon College, who is preparing an edition of Tatuin's as yet unpublished work). According to Schmitz (*Alcuini Ars grammatica* [1908], pp. 52, 53), Alcuin used Pompeius, Phocas, and possibly Diomedes, in addition to Donatus, Priscian, and Cassiodorus, mentioned by Ogilvy. A few other omissions may be noted: e.g., page 23, Alcuin, as well as Bede, used Caper; page 40, Tatuin used Gregory's *Cura pastoralis*; page 48, according to Traube (*Vorlesungen und Abhandlungen*, II [1911], 176), Isidore's *Historia Gothorum* may have served as a model for Bede's *Historia ecclesiastica*; page 57, for Julian of Toledo I have shown (*Miscellanea Fr. Ehrle*, I [1924], 50-65) that Aldhelm probably used Julian in his letter to Acircius, and that Bede made excerpts from Julian in his *De schematibus et tropis*. The surviving manuscripts of Julian's *Ars* descended from an Insular original; the oldest codex is an Anglo-Saxon manuscript of Fulda and the archetype may have come from England; page 58, Justinus should have been inserted with a cross-reference to Pompeius Trogus, who has come down to us only in the *Epitome* of Justinus; page 59, according to Manitius (*Geschichte*, p. 148, n. 2), Boniface used Juvencus; page 75, Alcuin used Priscian in his *Orthography* as well as in his grammar.

The author is often careless or inconsistent; e.g., the famous Berne Horace (363) is regularly referred to as an English manuscript of the eighth century

(pp. 20, 38, 68, 81), but on page 46 it is "an Hiberno-Latin MS of the eighth or ninth century"; here a reference is given to Whitley Stokes, *Goidelica* (1872), whereas on pages 38 and 81 reference is made to Schultze, *ZB. für Bibliothekswesen* (1889). Actually the script is Irish of the latter half of the ninth century; a complete facsimile, with an elaborate Introduction, has been available for study since 1897; page 21, the Bodleian uncial codex of the *Regula Benedicti* is 3684 (Hatton 48) not 4118 (Hatton 93). The latter is Bernard's number (*Catalogi librorum MSS Angliae et Hiberniae* [1697], p. 185), based on an old signature, "MS Hatton 93," which stands on folio 1 of the manuscript. Hatton 93 (4081) is Bernard's 4081 (Hatton 56.2) and contains *De officio missae* in an Anglo-Saxon hand, saec. VIII/IX; page 23, the Cambridge codex of Martianus Capella is not "eighth century with Irish glosses," but, according to Lindsay (*Early Welsh script*, pp. 19-22), a late ninth-century Welsh manuscript with Welsh glosses; page 28, in connection with Bede's citation from Cicero on the gender of *torquis* Ogilvy states that the word occurs in three passages in Cicero, the first of which (*Verres* iii.185) he regards as the probable source—all of them are impossible since in none can the gender of *torquis* be determined; page 28, Ogilvy correctly decides, in choosing between Cledonius and Pompeius as the source of Alcuin's "Terentius, 'Cette patri meo,' id est date . . . patri meo," that Pompeius is the more probable, but on page 84 he says, without reservation, that the citation is from Cledonius. This is a very unlikely source—the grammar of Cledonius was practically unknown to the Middle Ages, and it survives in only a single manuscript; page 31, Ogilvy, citing Roger, *L'enseignement des lettres classiques* (p. 329), to the effect that the English knew Consentius, remarks "on what evidence I have been unable to discover," but on page 333 (n. 8) Roger gives a list of excerpts taken by Tatwin from Consentius; in the same passage Roger asserts that the English knew Palaemon—a statement for which Ogilvy could not discover any evidence (p. 69). This is given by Roger on page 361 (n. 1) "d'après Victorinus-(Palaemon)"; page 35, it is not made clear that the Donatus who wrote the commentary on Vergil (Tiberius Claudius) is not the same as the famous grammarian (Aelius); page 37, the number of the Paris manuscript cited is 10400, not 104000.

The author is not always careful in regard to proper names; e.g., pages 6 (twice) and 21, read Hexaemeron (or Hexameron) for Hexamaeron; page 23, read Caper for Caprus; page 28, the heading is Claudian (correct), but in the next line we read Claudius; page 64, read Dynamidiorum for Dynamidorum; page 74, read Pompeius Trogus for Trogus Pompeius; Justinus' name is given as Justinus Frontinus instead of M. Junianus Justinus; page 74, read Optianus for Optantius; page 79, read Taius for Tagius; page 85, read Mopseustia (twice) for Mopseutia.

The bibliography is not always up to date; e.g., Thompson's *Introduction to Greek and Latin palaeography* (1912) should have been used instead of the

Handbook of Greek and Latin palaeography (1893) by the same author; page 74, the long-out-of-date *Geschichte der römischen Litteratur* by Bähr (1869) is cited, though several editions of the standard works of Teuffel and Schanz have since appeared.

In spite of its defects this little volume will be very useful to scholars working in the medieval field.

CHARLES H. BEESON

University of Chicago

Deux miracles de Gautier de Coinci. By ERIK BOMAN. Paris: E. Droz, 1935. Pp. exx+87.

This book forms a worthy supplement to Mme A. P. Ducrot-Granderye's very useful *Etudes sur les miracles Nostre Dame de Gautier de Coinci*¹ and represents another step toward eventual realization of what must be considered one of the greatest desiderata in the Romance field, a complete critical edition of Gautier de Coinci's *Miracles de la sainte Vierge*. Boman has made available, with critical apparatus from all the accessible manuscripts,² some thirteen hundred verses from the *Miracles*; and, employing a surer method than that of Ducrot-Granderye, has solidly established a number of manuscript relations, thereby giving us a substantial start toward solution of the exceedingly difficult and complex problem offered by the eighty-odd manuscripts which contain Gautier's work.

The two miracles Boman has edited are *Dou Gieu qui reçut en pleges l'ymage nostre Seigneur* and *De saint Basile*, Nos. 66 and 62, respectively, in Ducrot-Granderye's listing. Both are from the second book of the *Miracles*, a circumstance one may regret since the very interesting manuscript group ADGR, whose members contain only the first book, is thus excluded from consideration. The introduction includes an exhaustive study of the medieval Latin and Romance versions of the themes underlying the two miracles.³ This is accompanied by incidental publication of a number of not readily accessible texts. There is also, in addition to the attempt at classification of the manuscripts, a consideration of the versification and language of the two miracles. This, of course, bears upon too scant a portion of Gautier's work to carry any degree of conclusiveness, but the language study seems to indicate that the Picard element in Gautier's speech has been overestimated by

¹ *Annales academiae scientiarum Fennicae*, XXV, 2 (Helsinki, 1932).

² He was not so fortunate as Ducrot-Granderye in being granted access to the precious manuscript which has disappeared from the Grand Séminaire de Soissons.

³ Let us call attention to a rather important bibliographical omission in connection with this part of the work. Boman seems to have been unaware that T. F. Crane had republished with an introduction and notes Pez's edition of the *Liber de miraculis sanctae Dei Genetricis Mariae* (Ithaca, 1925).

those who are unwilling to concede that the author of the *Miracles* was a native of the Soissons region.⁴

Boman concurs with Ducrot-Granderye in finding M (B.N. fr. 2163) the manuscript most suitable to serve as the basis of an edition. Nevertheless, he has rejected no fewer than seventy perfectly acceptable readings of his basic manuscript because they were supported by none, or only a few, of the other manuscripts.⁵ Except for a few almost negligible errors,⁶ M has been carefully and intelligently copied. For a detailed criticism of the text one should consult Långfors' masterly review in *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*, XXXVI (1935), 237 ff.

The attempt at classing the manuscripts is Boman's most important contribution. He employs the so-called Lachmann method, which in spite of its shortcomings is still the most dependable. Proceeding with meet care and caution, he affirms only those relationships which can be demonstrated beyond reasonable doubt. These are GC, vBH, FL, DJ, NT₂b, T₁E, and Mx. In addition, he indicates as probable, but not yet sufficiently established, filiations between M and GC, between vBH and K, between DJ, NT₂b, O and o, and between T₁ and E.

V. FREDERIC KOENIG

University of Arizona

Three centuries of French poetic theory: A critical history of the chief arts of poetry in France (1328-1630). By WARNER FORREST PATTERSON. ("University of Michigan publications: Language and literature," Vols. XIV and XV.) Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1935. 2 vols.

In these two volumes, totaling over fifteen hundred pages, Mr. Patterson has undertaken one of the most difficult inquiries in the study of preclassical French literature—a history of poetic theory before 1630. He has conceived of this project as comprising the following parts (cf. his statement of purpose [I, xiv-xv]): (1) a history of poetic theory and versification, (2) a history of poetry, (3) a history of general aesthetics, (4) an apology for the French poetic tradition, (5) an anthology of selections from the theoretical documents, (6) an anthology of modern critical opinions about the poets and the theorists, (7) an anthology of the genres of poetry—in a word, he wishes (8) "To provide, in a single work, by all these several devices, source material, history, and interpretation useful to the historian of French poetry and literary criticism,

⁴ See in particular A. C. Ott, *Gautier de Coincy's Christinenleben* (Erlangen, 1922), p. cxxxvi, and L. Allen, "The birthplace of Gautier de Coincy," *MP*, XXXIII (1936), 239 ff.

⁵ In two cases—I, 295 and II, 629—the sense demands that the reading of M be retained in spite of the authority of the other manuscripts.

⁶ I, 455: *merveille* for *merveille*; I, 456: *esmerveille* for *esmerveille*; I, 463: *merveille* for *merveille*; I, 475: *jetast* for *metast* (*jetast* would have been a necessary correction, but *metast* should have appeared in the variants); II, 215: *veillent* for *voillent*.

to the specialist in versification, to the teacher of rhetoric, to the student of comparative literature, and to the philosopher of art."

It will be apparent, immediately, that a task so conceived is impossible of achievement. What Mr. Patterson proposes, explicitly, is to provide at once "source material, history, and interpretation" useful to specialists in six different fields. What he assumes, implicitly, is the necessity of treating simultaneously all the parts of a complex historical situation. To make this assumption is to deny the possibility of history of any kind. For the method of history must always proceed from analysis to synthesis; and analysis involves, by definition, a resolution into elements and a treatment of each element as a separate entity. In this respect the method of history is that of any science. It is only when the elements have been so analyzed that one may begin to reassemble them by synthesis. Now Mr. Patterson has tried to do both analysis and synthesis at the same time. He has wished not only to trace several distinct parallel histories—one of poetic theory, another of poetry, a third of the lives of the poets and the theorists, a fourth of later critical estimates—but also to indicate all the multiple intersecting lines which connect these parallel lines with one another. This is to defeat the purpose of history. For if all the data are given in the same complex relationships which united them originally, what has been the function of the historian?

An examination of Mr. Patterson's volumes will show that the historian—if by historian we mean one who arranges and interprets the data relevant to a single problem—has played no part at all. For the central problem—a history of poetic theory—is everywhere subordinated to host of irrelevant considerations. Irrelevant, in the first place, are all the discussions of poets and of their poems, all the long quotations from three centuries of French verse; these discussions and these quotations occupy about two-thirds of the entire work. Four hundred pages of Volume II are devoted to anthologies of lyric poetry during these years, arranged by forms (not "genres," as the author claims). In Volume I the major part of each chapter is concerned with poetry, not with poetics. Take the chapter on Ronsard as an example: of 126 pages devoted to Ronsard (I, 487-613), only 41 pages treat of his poetic theory; the others are employed in studying his life, his poetry, his philosophy as expressed in his poems (some seventy-five of which are quoted fully or in part), and in citing numerous appreciations of Ronsard by critics and biographers. The same practice is followed in other chapters.

Irrelevant, in the second place, are Mr. Patterson's attempts to relate the history of poetic theory in his chosen period to the general history of aesthetics. To do this he introduces such *hors-d'œuvre* as the summaries of Horace's *Ars poetica* (I, 970-73) and of Boileau's *Art poétique* (I, 975-78), and the long quotations from modern aestheticians at the beginnings of chapters. Similarly, he prepares, in the final chapter of Volume I, syntheses of "The Greek philosophy of poetry" and of "The adaptation to France of the Greek aesthet-

ie tradition." One might ask, indeed, whether—to be really complete—Mr. Patterson should not also have included a synthesis of "The Latin philosophy of poetry." For, far from being "rather transmissive than profound," as he asserts (I, 834), the Latin theorists exerted a notable independent influence on French poetic theory of the Renaissance.

Irrelevant, in the third place, are most of the materials included under the heading of poetic theory proper. Mr. Patterson makes "poetic theory" include such fields as the history of versification and the question of the vernacular language. Most of Part I (chaps. i-vii) is concerned with the study of the *arts de seconde rhétorique*—works devoted to the description of the complicated verse forms of the Middle Ages. Similarly, there are long discussions of works or passages which deal with the question of the vernacular versus the Latin language (cf. I, 300-304). Again, we find long digressions—philosophical (cf. I, 246-50), biographical (cf. I, 616-18), historical (cf. I, 71-75). In the footnotes we discover references to a host of books and articles dealing not only with the critical work under examination but with its author's life, his other writings, his friends and their lives, his critics, etc. (cf. I, 295-96 [n. 7]); relatively few of these items are called upon for contributions to the text itself. In the text Mr. Patterson has included innumerable quotations from modern literary manuals—Lanson, Petit de Julleville, Bédier et Hazard, Crépet's anthology; the usefulness of such general statements in the examination of a particular problem is highly questionable. As for the critical documents themselves, these are usually presented in a chronological rather than in a logical arrangement, since the author wishes to quote the significant passages in the framework of a running summary; again, the method is anthological rather than critical.

Besides these errors of general conception, Mr. Patterson has made mistakes in the recording of his materials, some of them serious. I mention only a few. (1) He has usually read critical texts only in modern editions; where they have not been re-edited, he has read only fragments in general works or studies (cf. I, 639 n., 690, n. 11, and 821 n.). Thus we cannot be sure that he has adequately surveyed his basic documents. (2) He has given no page references for passages cited from the *arts poétiques*, contenting himself with indication of the edition. In the anthologies he gives no source whatsoever for the texts of the poems printed. (3) His indications of sources for critical theories are of the most summary. The worst omission is the failure to treat the influence of Italian critical documents on the French—an influence apparent to the most casual reader of both critical literatures in this period. The author (although he gives most of the bibliography) has apparently studied at first hand only a few Italian Renaissance critical works, and his materials must be supplemented by a study of this important influence.

Mr. Patterson might have chosen any one of his objectives as the central theme of a history or of an anthology. He might—limiting himself to poetic

theory—have produced a collection of texts carefully edited and annotated; or he might have written a history of the ideas contained in these texts. By attempting to do both at once, and to supplement them by a whole series of subsidiary histories and anthologies, Mr. Patterson has succeeded only in confusing inextricably these various ends. He has left off where he should have begun—with the recording of a vast body of materials. It is to be hoped that he will eventually return to the data he has collected and make clear their significance for the history of French poetic theory.

BERNARD WEINBERG

University of Chicago

Ancients and moderns: A study of the background of the "Battle of the books."

By RICHARD FOSTER JONES. ("Washington University studies: Language and literature" [N.S.], No. 6.) St. Louis, 1936. Pp. xi+358.

Mr. Jones's *Ancients and moderns* is considerably more than an expansion of his well-known early study of the background of the *Battle of the books*. It is an extended, thoroughly documented account of various aspects of the conflict during the seventeenth century between the progressivist ideas of the scientists and their allies and the traditionalism of their opponents. The growth of the experimental spirit, the cultivation of inventive genius, the spread of an idea of progress, the humanitarian impulses underlying scientific activities in England, the problem of certainty—these and similar themes are presented with detailed illustrations in the text and in the extensive notes. The book is, however, with its numerous interpretative suggestions, more than a repository of valuable information. It is consequently somewhat unfortunate that Mr. Jones seems to have almost as great a fear of oversystematizing as the men of whom he writes, for the chapter headings are rather more convenient for the classification of texts than for the organization of the ideas. The idea of progress, for instance, a concept closely related to the main theme, is nowhere fully analyzed, though it is frequently considered throughout the study. Similarly, though with more concentration, the suggestions concerning the relation between Puritanism and the scientific spirit appear in disconnected portions of the study. In view of the absence of any index this becomes an acute failing; and the historical sweep aimed at not only involves considerable repetition, but partially conceals some of the more original features of the book.

The stated aim of the book is to give a history "not of science but of the idea of science in the seventeenth century." Mr. Jones is equally explicit in his reasons for the particular focus which he gives to his material:

The idea of science, though it possessed numerous satellite notions, had to do primarily with the observational and experimental method. This method was presented in sharp contrast and direct opposition to reliance on classical antiquity,⁸⁰

that
solve
vi].
Not
facto
of ita
emati
natio
land
resol
ever
notic
and
loom
Mr.
influ
spirit
stant
ence
Bapt
compe
influ
emph

Th
ancie
illust
the w
Aristo
uity a
tional
tend a
feature
strikin
the ad
cients
this "
and w
theory
theori
to a ri

⁸⁰ E.
Gianvil
those gi
account

that in the last analysis an account of the conception of experimental science resolves itself into a history of the quarrel between the ancients and moderns [p. vi].

Not a few will question whether this description of the idea of science is satisfactory in its total disregard of a feature of science so essential to the method of its most brilliant seventeenth-century exponents—the application of mathematics to the study of motion. And even if we hesitantly agree that the definition will do as a statement of what was the popular idea of science in England at the time, it may be difficult to agree that its history is best ultimately resolved into the question of ancients versus moderns. Thus defined, however, the history of the idea of science might well begin with Mr. Jones's notice of the attitude of the Elizabethans, of the idea of the decay of nature, and of the pronouncements of Gilbert and Bacon. Bacon, in consequence, looms up as the prime mover of the scientific movement in England. It is Mr. Jones's conviction that "in almost every aspect of the revolt Bacon's influence is apparent; to him more than to any other single man were due its spirit and success" (p. 152). The numerous allusions to Bacon cited in substantiation of this view demonstrate further what is known to students of science in England—that Bacon was by many looked upon as a kind of John the Baptist in the intellectual wilderness, if not as the Messiah himself; yet the complexity of the situation makes one skeptical of some of the assertions of influence and inclined to believe that other forces have been obscured by the emphasis on this one, however important.¹

This complexity is apparent to Mr. Jones. He shows us the status of the ancient-modern controversy among scientists, physicians, educators, etc.; his illustrations, moreover, suggest how confused a front the enemy presented in the writings of the "moderns," the attack being directed at times against Aristotle, at times against his scholastic interpreters, at times against antiquity as a drag on progress, at times against the schools as custodians of traditional authority. But Mr. Jones's interpretation of the problem does not sub-tend all the variations which his account reveals, and there are some significant features which he does not adequately call attention to. Of these the most striking, and paradoxical, from the point of view of ancients versus moderns is the admiration expressed by the scientific writers for a particular group of ancients, notably those before Aristotle. Political motives may have entered into this "pre-Aristotelianism," but the frequency with which it was expressed, and with which such novelties as the atomic hypothesis and the heliocentric theory of the solar system were regarded as modernized restorations of older theories, strengthens the likelihood of sincerity. Bacon's similitude of time to a river which carries down what is light and sinks what is weighty and solid

¹ E.g., the parallel ideas to which Mr. Jones points to show that "the explanations which Gianvili gives for human ignorance . . . both in content and tone, read remarkably like those given by Bacon for the deficiency of knowledge" (p. 319, n. 65) may be quite readily accounted for by the very general influence of a revitalized Pyrrhonism.

finds illustration in the Greek atomists and others of the pre-Aristotelian philosophers.² And Bacon considered it one of Aristotle's major crimes that he eclipsed these men from the regard of posterity.³ Boyle enlarged on these sentiments, with the addition of Plato's name;⁴ and the general popularity of such views gave Sprat enough concern to prompt his caution to those who "renounc'd the authority of Aristotle; but then restor'd some one or other of the *Ancient Sects* in his stead."⁵ Add to the prevalence of these views the regard in which certain of Aristotle's works were held by many of the same writers,⁶ and the picture of the ancient-modern controversy undergoes some interesting modification. This quarrel was in reality a minor aspect of their major offensive, promoted in the interest of what became known as "free enquiry." Obstacles that stood in the way—for instance, traditionally accepted sciences and disciplines, theological opposition, social objections, preference for humanistic studies, etc.—they tried to overthrow or circumvent as the need arose. Their attitude toward the ancients was a function of this larger aim, and hence is generally occasional and often inconsistent in a way which is not characteristic of their attack on their central objective.

On this main point the scientists and their friends drove with an enthusiasm that is contagious even today. Mr. Jones has not wholly escaped the contagion. As a critical student of his material, he interpolates an occasional warning voice or a reference to philosophical difficulties; but, generally speaking, it is the glad shout of triumph of the heroes which we hear as they point to the rays of light showing the road to escape from the cave of error. Such admiration is natural enough, but, as so often happens in studies of this nature, it results in an inadequate account of the opposition; and, in spite of Mr. Jones's sympathetic account of Casaubon's position, this appears querulous, or misguided, or worshipful of tradition. There is much truth in this characterization, but it is not the full truth. Wallis and Ward, for example, scientists and Oxford professors, were merely showing the moderation of intelligent men in their reply to Webster's absurdly one-sided proposal for remodelling

² *Advancement of learning*, in *Works* (Boston, 1863), VI, 131; *Novum organum*, Book I, aphorism lxxi. "With regard to the dogmas of the ancient philosophers, as those of Pythagoras, Philolaus, Xenophanes, Anaxagoras, Parmenides, Leucippus, Democritus, and the rest, (which men usually pass over with disdain), it will not be amiss to look upon them somewhat more modestly" (*De augmentis*, in *Works*, VIII, 502; II, 285).

³ *De augmentis*, in *Works*, VIII, 502; II, 285–86; see also *Advancement*, in *Works*, VI, 215–16.

⁴ *The excellency of theology*, in *Works* (London, 1772), IV, 57–59. Glanvill illustrates all the varieties of this pre-Aristotelianism. See *Scopis scientifica*, pp. 107–8 (*Vanity of dogmatizing*, pp. 145–46); "Letter concerning Aristotle," in *Scopis*, pp. 84, 87–89; "Scire/i tuum nihil est," in *Scopis*, pp. 67–68; *Plus ultra*, pp. 25–26, 40; "Of scepticism and certainty," in *Essays*, II, 60; "Anti-fanatical religion," in *Essays*, VII, 8, 47, 50.

⁵ *History of the Royal Society* (London, 1722), pp. 34–35.

⁶ Glanvill, e.g., expressed himself as quite willing to praise Aristotle's "Rhetoric, History of Animals, and Mechanicks" (*Plus ultra*, sig. [B5]); see also Bacon, *Advancement*, in *Works*, VI, 126; and Boyle, *Origines of forms and qualities*, in *Works*, III, 9.

ing the university curriculum, and not facing the dilemma which Mr. Jones creates for them, "in which they found it necessary either to combat the new science, to which they also paid allegiance, or to deny the truth of Webster's description of the universities, too much of which they knew was correct" (p. 114). The characteristic emphasis of the study is also illustrated in the slight notice given to White's reply to Glanvill, the essential point of which appears in a note without much comment (p. 319). White is not an important figure, but neither are many of the others treated in detail in Mr. Jones's book, and his pamphlet does reflect the gist of an important issue in the general controversy. White attacks crude experimental empiricism as philosophically weak, and he points out the confusion, often apparent, between science and applied science.⁷ What such men as White were saying has been neglected because of the absurdity of some of their arguments and because of the ultimate spread of experimental science, yet their criticism did aim at certain characteristic marks of seventeenth-century scientific thought. The principal influence of Bacon was perhaps not on the establishment of a sound scientific method but on the development of laboratory technique and on the encouragement of technological and mechanical progress. Moreover, Bacon's stress on empirical observation and his criticism of logic encouraged a consequent antirationalism.⁸ Such features of the new science precipitated an opposition that was only incidentally, if at all, engaged in the conflict between moderns and ancients *per se*, but involved opposing conceptions of science itself.

There was, indeed, a quarrel of the ancients and moderns, and what Mr. Jones adds to former studies so far enlarges our knowledge of its origins and diffusion that it is possible to admire his book while differing on matters of interpretation. But from what has been said it might be proper to suspect that we have been misled somewhat concerning its real importance, that in fact, as far as the new science was concerned, the issue was a "political" one, and that it is therefore confusing to insist that "in the last analysis an account of the conception of experimental science resolves itself into a history of the quarrel between the ancients and moderns." It was for many reasons inevitable, as Mr. Jones shows us, that the issue should have been raised in the determined propaganda of the scientists, but, once introduced, it often helped

⁷ *An exclusion of scepticks from all title to dispute* (London, 1665) is the title of the English translation of White's reply. White is afraid that the belittling of Aristotle may take "Science it self out of the hands of the Learned, and throw it into the dirt of *Probability*" (p. 55). He maintains that a science cannot grope for its principles, but must direct its inquiries in terms of them: "'tis in vain to make Experiments for acquiring Science: Since, they will all come at length to be resolv'd into these Principles; or else there will be ever a straining after Science unprofitably, without any Principles at all" (p. 72). What the defenders of the new science praise as advances in science are really developments in technology: "all the inventions he [Glanvill] speaks of belong to Artificers and Handy-craft Men; not Philosophers, whose office is to *make use of* Experiments for Science, not to *make them*" (p. 73).

⁸ Mr. Jones calls attention to these features of English science on several occasions: see pp. 49, 206, 213.

to obscure what was more important and vital. It attached itself to other issues like a parasite and grew at their expense. It is for this reason that the quarrel of the ancients and moderns, though important in itself and significant in the study of such questions as the idea of progress, is actually an unsatisfactory framework for the analysis of many important features of the idea of science. A quarrel there certainly was, and it raised much dust and heat, but it is perhaps not the most revealing vantage point for viewing the more serious questions that emerged with the growth of the new science.

M. E. PRIOR

Northwestern University

Johnson and English poetry before 1660. By W. B. C. WATKINS. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1936. Pp. 120.

This book will be of great interest not only to Johnson scholars but to students of pre-Restoration literature. In an admirable introduction Mr. Watkins has explained the apparent contradictions in some of Johnson's literary criticisms: "Three deep-seated personal traits," he says, "are of the utmost importance to a full appreciation of Johnson's criticism: his dislike of imitations, his obstinate persistence in a challenged opinion, and, most important of all, his detestation of exaggerated praise" (p. 3).

The critical student, however, will no doubt take issue with the author's statement in his preface, that the scope of his subject precluded "exhaustive treatment," and that it is questionable whether further investigation "would be really profitable" (p. v). For the failure to trace every available clue has resulted in a minimizing of Johnson's knowledge of the period under discussion, and has left with the reader a sense of inadequacy in the treatment of the subject as a whole. Space permits only a few illustrations of these defects in an otherwise satisfactory study, and I shall confine myself to pointing out these sins of omission in the poetry sections, though, for greater completeness, Mr. Watkins has made excursions into Johnson's knowledge of early prose writers, too.

After four pages devoted to Johnson's knowledge of Chaucer, the author is content to state that "apart from Chaucer's prose, in the Introduction to the *Dictionary* Johnson quotes 287 lines of Chaucer's poetry" (p. 40, n. 2), and later, "In the body of the *Dictionary* he quotes Chaucer sixteen times" (pp. 40-41). If all, or most, of these quotations had been traced to their sources, Johnson's familiarity with the following would have been established: *The legend of good women*,¹ *The wife of Bath's prologue*,² *The Parson's tale*,³

¹ *Dictionary* under "coy" ("The legend of Hypsipyle and Medea," ll. 1548-49, Chaucer, *Complete works*, Student's Cambridge edition, ed. F. N. Robinson).

² *Ibid.*, under "defended," ll. 59-60; and in Johnson's *Lives*, ed. G. B. Hill, III, 225-26.

³ *Dictionary* under "huggermugger"; the quotation is l. 583 of the *Parson's tale* in the foregoing edition.

The Summoner's tale,⁴ *The Miller's tale*,⁵ *Troilus and Criseyde*,⁶ *The Romaunt of the rose*,⁷ and *The book of the duchess*.⁸ Nor are Johnson's quotations confined to the *Dictionary* only, but in his edition of *Shakespeare* he has occasion to explain the meaning of the word "engine" in the line, "Like an engine wrench'd my frame of nature." His comment is: "Mr. Edwards conjectures that an engine is the rack. He is right. To engine is, in Chaucer, to strain upon the rack."⁹ It is probable that Johnson had in mind these lines from *The Nun's Priest's tale*:

And eek the hostiler so soore engyned,
That they biknewe hir wikkednesse anon,
And were anhanged by the nekke-bon.¹⁰

It is this kind of reasonable conjecturing that Mr. Watkins does not attempt. One of Johnson's notes to *Othello* proves that he was familiar with this tale.¹¹

Similar deficiencies are noticeable in Mr. Watkins' treatment of Johnson's knowledge of ballad literature. Though the author is right in his general conclusion that Johnson enjoyed ballads but did not consider them a high form of art, he has omitted to show Johnson's familiarity with the following: "King Cophetua and the beggar-maid,"¹² "The ballad of Jane Shore,"¹³ "Child Walter and a lady,"¹⁴ "Gilderoy,"¹⁵ Lady Wardlaw's "Hardyknute," wherein Johnson seemed to detect the hoax,¹⁶ and the little song "Willow, willow, willow."¹⁷ The fact that Johnson was able to sing verses from the ballad of *Chevy Chase* and quote it in the *Dictionary*, leads Mr. Watkins into saying that Johnson "was very fond, too, of *Chevy Chase*,"¹⁸ but this fondness is scarcely borne out by what he said of it in his life of Addison: "In *Chevy Chase* there is not much of either bombast or affectation; but there is chill and lifeless imbecility. The story cannot possibly be told in a manner that shall make less impression on the mind."¹⁹

⁴ *Ibid.*, under "hurlet," where l. 1754 is quoted.

⁵ Under "quaint," l. 3275 is quoted.

⁶ Under "shall," Book III, l. 1649 is quoted.

⁷ Under "to sneak," l. 4533 is quoted; and under "takil," l. 1729.

⁸ Under "welkin," l. 343 is quoted.

⁹ Johnson, *Shakespeare* (1765), VIII, Appendix to Vol. VI.

¹⁰ These are ll. 4250-52 of this tale.

¹¹ *Shakespeare*, VIII, Appendix to Vol. VIII, where he quotes ll. 4043-44 of the same tale.

¹² Johnson writes a note on *Love's Labour's Lost* (IV, I), in his edition of *Shakespeare*, II, 151, n. 2.

¹³ Referred to in a note on *King Henry V*, (IV, xv), in *Shak.*, IV, 463.

¹⁴ In a note on *King Lear* (III, viii), in *Shak.*, VI, 94, n. 3.

¹⁵ In a note on *Hamlet* (III, vii), in *Shak.*, VIII, 226, n. 5.

¹⁶ Reported by Boswell, L. F. Powell's revised edition (1934), II, 91.

¹⁷ In a note to *Othello* (IV, xiii), in *Shak.*, VIII, 446, n. 5.

¹⁸ Watkins, p. 45.

¹⁹ Johnson, *Lives of the Poets*, ed. G. B. Hill (Oxford, 1905), II, 147-48.

On page 52 Mr. Watkins sympathetically attributes Johnson's confusion over the authorship of the poems in Tottel's *Miscellany* to a carelessness in reading. But Johnson was not alone in his confusion, and the author is incorrect in his statement that "Johnson never mentions Wyat except this one time."²⁰ For in his edition of Ascham's *English works*²¹ Johnson corrects the mistake of calling Lord Henry Howard, *Thomas Earl of Surrey*, and then says, "Of him, and Sir Thomas Wyat [sic], I find this character in the author above mentioned: 'I repute them, between whom I find little difference, for the two chief lanterns of light to all others, that have since employed their pens upon English poesy!'" Johnson is here quoting from *The art of English poesy*, a book which he knew, but whose author he did not know at this time.²²

Another inaccuracy is suggested on page 55, where Mr. Watkins says that Johnson seemed to know nothing of Turberville among others. That he knew something of his poetry is indicated by the fact that he has quoted eight lines from Turberville's second eclogue entitled *Fortunatus* under "trull" in the *Dictionary*.²³

There is an omission in the Spenser section where no mention is made of Johnson's quotation from *Colin Clouts come home againe*, which he gave under "emulung" in the *Dictionary*, and probably had in mind when he explained the meaning of "singult" as, "according to Spenser, a sigh."²⁴

Johnson's familiarity with Sir Philip Sidney's pastoral entertainment, *The lady of the May*, is not mentioned by Mr. Watkins. It was in his notes to *Love's labour's lost* that Johnson said he had previously thought that the character of "Holofernes" in that play was "borrowed from the *Rhombus* of Sir Philip Sidney."²⁵ The passage Johnson had in mind was that where "Rombus the schoole-maister" enters and speaks his "leash of languages" at once.²⁶

A slip occurs on page 75, where Mr. Watkins says that Johnson quotes ten lines from Davies' poem *Nosce te ipsum* in his notes to the *Comedy of errors*, whereas the quotation is made in the notes to *Much ado about nothing*.²⁷

²⁰ P. 53.

²¹ Ed. James Bennet (London, MDCCCLXI), p. 331 n. For attribution of this edition to Johnson see L. F. Powell's revision of *Boswell* (1934), I, xlii-xiv.

²² When he later wrote his life of Dryden he named Webb and Puttenham as the authors (see *Lives*, ed. G. B. Hill, I, 410-11).

²³ From *The Egloga of Mantuan turned into english verse & set forth with the argument to every eclogue* (1567), p. 14, ll. 15-22.

²⁴ These are ll. 168 and 169 from *Colin Clouts come home againe*:

"And euer and anon with singults rife
He cryed out, to make his undersong."

²⁵ *Shak.*, II, 155, n. 7

²⁶ Sidney, *Complete works*, ed. A. Feuillerat ("Cambridge English classics"), II, 336

²⁷ *Shak.*, III, 176, n. 7. The lines under discussion are in one of Beatrice's speeches to the messenger, in Act I, Scene i.

A greater cause for regret is that Mr. Watkins did not make his references to the standard editions of Boswell's *Life* and Johnson's *Lives of the poets*, for the greater convenience of his readers. When Mr. L. F. Powell revised Birkbeck Hill's edition of Boswell's *Life of Johnson* in 1934, he wrote in the preface, "to maintain the standard method of reference was imperative," and added, "Dr. Hill's edition has long been accepted as standard; it has accordingly been referred to by volume and page in most works of reference and many other important books published during the last half century."²⁸ Consequently the pagination of this new edition corresponds exactly with that of the old, yet it is impossible to locate Mr. Watkins' references in this standard edition. Similarly, a greater number of Johnson students will have access to Birkbeck Hill's edition of Johnson's *Lives of the poets* than will have access to Johnson's 1783 edition from which Mr. Watkins quotes.

In commanding this fruitful study to all Johnson scholars, may I close with the author's words of appreciation of another work: "Its virtues far outweigh its faults, a certain number of which one must usually take for granted, since poets (and prose-writers) are human."²⁹

DORIS B. SAUNDERS

University of Manitoba

Die religiöse und die humanitätsphilosophische Bildungsidee und die Entstehung des deutschen Bildungsromans im 18. Jahrhundert. By E. L. STAHL. ("Sprache und Dichtung: Forschungen zur Sprach- und Literaturwissenschaft," Heft 56.) Bern, 1934. Pp. 174.

The purpose and organization of this Doctor's dissertation are revealed almost completely in the title. The author first distinguishes between "Bildung," "Erziehung," and "Entwicklung"; then he analyzes the religious "Bildungsidee," the "humanitätsphilosophische Bildungsidee"; next he contrasts the two, and traces the "Ideeengeschichte" of the change from the one to the other; lastly, he follows out the rise of the German "Bildungsroman" of the eighteenth century. He uses Herder and Wilhelm von Humboldt to illustrate the perfect formulation of the "Humanitätsphilosophie," which held sway in the period between *Sturm und Drang* and Romanticism, and to *Wilhelm Meisters Lehrjahre* he accords the honor of being the first "Bildungsroman" with this philosophic content. The author attempts no complete portrayal of the "Bildungsroman"; he is concerned only in explaining the development of the ideals of this literary type out of religious sources, and, to a much less extent, out of certain biological theories, and he disclaims the intention of exhausting even this problem.

²⁸ L. F. Powell, *Boswell's Life of Johnson*, ed. G. B. Hill (Oxford, 1934), I, [v].

²⁹ Watkins, pp. 3-4. (Parentheses are mine.)

The author employs the analytic method much more than the chronological or historical one. He writes:

Religiöse Bildung ist die von der göttlichen Gnade direkt oder durch Vermittlung der Sakramente (besonders der Eucharistie) bewirkte Wiederherstellung der Gottebenbildlichkeit im Menschen, im Sinne einer Umbildung der mitgegebenen natürlichen Kräfte und einer Überbildung derselben in die übernatürliche göttliche Steinsart [sic].

Humanitätsphilosophische Bildung ist die durch den Einfluss weltlicher Mächte veranlasste Entfaltung der Totalität einzelmenschlicher Anlagen, im Sinne einer Anbildung jener weltlichen und Ausbildung dieser mitgegebenen natürlichen Kräfte [p. 52].

He also distinguishes between the conception of individualism of the Renaissance and of *Sturm und Drang*, on the one hand, and of "Humanitätsphilosophie," on the other; in the former era man aimed at universality in "Bildung," at manysidedness, while in the period of the latter he developed as completely as possible only those characteristics which he has by nature. Mr. Stahl defines the purpose of the *Bildungsroman* as follows:

die Daseinsform eines Menschen zu erfassen und genetisch zu begreifen, kein Geschehen blos äußerlicher Natur zu beschreiben, sondern nur solchen Ereignissen in der Erzählung Raum zu gewähren, die, in näherer oder entfernterer Weise, auf das gestaltgewinnende Innere des Menschen einen Einfluss ausüben [p. 115].

The "Bildungsroman" portrays the life of the hero "von der Kindheit an bis zur Reife, d.h. bis diejenige Form erreicht ist, die in der Absicht des Dichters liegt" (p. 116). In the present instance the objective is that of "humanitätsphilosophische Bildung." The "Bildungsroman" must therefore be distinguished from the "Erziehungsroman" and the "Entwicklungsroman."

The problem which this study handles is both interesting and important. The author has worked it out with enthusiasm and considerable precision of thought. The amount of repetition which he allows himself, however, is far too great, and much of the material does not deserve such lengthy treatment. The reviewer confesses to a dislike for this jumping from one name to another, with little or no regard for causal connection so characteristic of "Ideen geschichte." He sees no reason for dealing with twenty names of persons or schools or ages of culture between Plato and Herder in the fifty-seven pages devoted to chapter v. Unless treated functionally, he finds no particular value in this sort of analysis. It seems a form of intellectual gymnastics. Moreover, the first four chapters could have been profitably condensed. In short, the study could have been confined to an article or two without sacrifice of content; but these articles would have been worth while.

EUGENE N. ANDERSON

American University, Washington, D.C.

Bibliographies of twelve Victorian authors [Arnold, Mrs. Browning, Clough, Fitzgerald, Thomas Hardy, Kipling, William Morris, Christina Rossetti, D. G. Rossetti, Stevenson, Swinburne, and Tennyson]. Compiled by THEODORE G. EHRSAM, ROBERT H. DEILY, and ROBERT M. SMITH. New York: H. W. Wilson Co., 1936. Pp. 362.

Students and scholars in the Victorian period will welcome this comprehensive and very useful work. Compiled from more than two hundred sources, it comprises bibliographical, biographical, and critical articles, pamphlets, essays, and books in English and foreign languages, including unpublished Master's essays and doctoral dissertations. The lists are complete up to July, 1934, and every effort has evidently been made to give completeness to the biographical and critical section. The form adopted is that of the library reference book, such as the *Reader's guide*; no commentary or annotation is included, and abbreviation is used intensively to conserve space. Each author is presented under three headings: "Chronological outline," "Bibliographical material," and "Biographical and critical material." For books and pamphlets, in addition to the usual data, there are generous lists of reviews. All material is printed in double columns.

This work should prove an invaluable guide. An examination of a good number of its entries reveals a very high standard of accuracy, and its comprehensiveness should be a source of comfort to any reader. Yet certain users of the book will note that, whereas two of Matthew Arnold's posthumous works are listed in Section I, there is no mention there of *Essays in criticism* (3d ser., 1910). In Section III one misses likewise the following titles, listed in Iris Esther Sells' *Matthew Arnold and France: the poet* (1935): Charles Cestre, "The Church of Brou de M. Arnold," in the *Revue germanique*, 1908; C.-E. Engel, *La littérature alpestre en France et en Angleterre* (Chambéry, 1930); and M. Moraud, *Le romantisme français en Angleterre de 1814 à 1848* (Paris, 1933). It is possible that the second and third of these three items might justifiably be omitted, but not if the compilers enter, as they do, Alexander P. Kelso's *Matthew Arnold on Continental life and literature* (1914). In Section I on Tennyson, in the "Chronological outline," the two-volume edition of the *Poems* of 1842 is listed as *Morte d'Arthur, Dora, and other idylls*, which are merely a part of the *Poems*, and which had had an earlier privately printed edition. This may lead to some confusion. This is especially true when we notice that in Section III (p. 351), after "Poems. London, Moxon, 1832, etc.," the compilers add: "Poems were also issued in 1842, 1843, 1846, etc." Finally, Frances Winwar's *Poor splendid wings* (1933) might well be listed under Swinburne, since Swinburne figures in that work almost as much as the Rossettis and William Morris.

In view of the admirable workmanship in these bibliographies, criticism risks the appearance of carping. The compilers have done a valuable and lasting piece of work which will inevitably place students of Victorian poetry heavily in their debt.

CHARLES FREDERICK HARROLD

Michigan State Normal College

BOOKS RECEIVED

BERNER, ERNST. *Lautgebärde und Schallbild im indeeuropäischen Sprachbau*. Troppau: A. Krestas Buchhandlung, 1936. Pp. 64.

BORGERHOFF, E. B. O. *The evolution of liberal theory and practice in the French theater, 1680-1757*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1936. Pp. 117.

Boswell's Journal of a tour to the Hebrides with Samuel Johnson, LL.D. Now first published from the original manuscript. Prepared for the press, with preface and notes by FREDERICK A. POTTLE and CHARLES H. BENNETT. New York: Viking Press, 1936. Pp. xiv+435.

BRADBROOK, M. C. *The school of night: a study in the literary relationships of Sir Walter Raleigh*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; New York: Macmillan, 1936. Pp. 190.

Canti carnascialeschi del rinascimento. A cura di CHARLES S. SINGLETON. ("Scrittori d'Italia," No. 159.) Bari: Laterza & Figli, 1936. Pp. 498.

CHADWICK, H. MUNRO, and CHADWICK, N. KERSHAW. *The growth of literature*. Vol. II. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; New York: Macmillan, 1936. Pp. xvii+783.

Coleridge's miscellaneous criticism. Edited by THOMAS MIDDLETON RAYSOR. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1936. Pp. xvi+468.

COSMO, UMBERTO. *L'ultima ascesa: introduzione alla lettura del "Paradiso."* ("Biblioteca cultura moderna.") Bari: Laterza & Figli, 1936. Pp. 428.

EBERT, WOLFGANG; FRINGS, THEODOR; GLEISZNER, KATHE; KOTZSCHKE, RUDOLF; AND STREITBERG, GERMART. *Kulturräume und Kulturströmungen im mitteldeutschen Osten*. ("Veröffentlichung der Forschungsinstitute für Kultur- und Universalgeschichte und für neuere Philologie, Abt. ältere Germanistik, sowie des

Instituts für Heimatforschung an der Universität Leipzig.") Halle (Saale): Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1936. 2 vols.

The Exeter Book. Edited by GEORGE PHILIP KRAPP and ELLIOTT VAN KIRK DOBBIE. ("The Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records, a collective edition," Vol. III.) New York: Columbia University Press, 1936. Pp. cxvii+382.

GAMILLSCHEG, ERNST. *Die Mundart von Serbănești-Titulești (Gerichtsbezirk Olt. Kreis Videa)*. ("Berliner Beiträge zur romanischen Philologie," Band VI, Heft 1-2.) Jena and Leipzig: Verlag von Wilhelm Grohna, 1936. Pp. 230.

GOTTSCHALK, WALTER. *Die Bildhaftes Sprichwörter der Romanen*. Vol. II: *Der Mensch im Sprichwort der romanischen Völker*. ("Sammlung romanischer Elementar- und Handbücher," Reihe IV, No. 4.) Heidelberg: Carl Winters Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1936. Pp. viii+356+16.

GUIET, RENÉ. *L'Evolution d'un genre: le livret d'opéra en France de Gluck à la Révolution (1774-1793)*. ("Smith College studies in modern languages," Vol. XVIII, Nos. 1-4.) Northampton, Mass.: Smith College, [1936]. Pp. 199.

HENDREN, J. W. *A study of ballad rhythm, with special reference to ballad music*. ("Princeton studies in English," No. 14.) Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1936. Pp. xii+177.

A concordance to the poems of Robert Herrick. Compiled and edited by MALCOLM MACLEOD. New York: Oxford University Press, 1936. Pp. xviii+299.

HESSEN'S IRISH LEXICON: A CONCISE DICTIONARY OF EARLY IRISH WITH DEFINITIONS IN GERMAN AND ENGLISH. By SÉAMUS CAOMHÁNACH, RUDOLF HERTZ, VERNON E. HULL, GUSTAV LEHMACHER, S. J., et al. Vol. II, fasc. 1: *I-luchair*. Halle (Saale): Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1936. Pp. 80.

HILLHOUSE, JAMES T. *The Waverley novels and their critics*. Minneapolis, Minn.: University of Minnesota Press, 1936. Pp. xi+357.

KELLERMANN, WILHELM. *Aufbaustil und Weltbild Chrestiens von Troyes im Percevalroman*. ("Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie," Heft 88.) Halle (Saale): Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1936. Pp. x+232.

KRÜGER, MAX. *Die Entwicklung und Bedeutung des Nonnenklosters Port-Royal im 17. Jahrhundert (1609-1709): ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des französischen Geistes*. ("Romanistische Arbeiten," Band XXVI.) Halle (Saale): Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1936. Pp. xi+365.

KRÜGER, PAUL. *Fransk litterær kritik indtil 1830; ideer og metoder*. Copenhagen: Levin & Munksgaard, 1936. Pp. viii+304.

LEVIN, LAWRENCE MEYER. *The political doctrine of Montesquieu's "Esprit des Lois": its classical background*. ("Publications of the Institute of French Studies, Inc.") New York: Columbia University, [1936]. Pp. xiii+359.

LOGAN, JAMES VENABLE. *The poetry and aesthetics of Erasmus Darwin*. ("Princeton studies in English," No. 15.) Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1936. Pp. 162.

MCKILLOP, ALAN DUGALD. *Samuel Richardson, printer and novelist*. Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press, 1936. Pp. xi+357.

MACLEAN, KENNETH. *John Locke and English literature of the eighteenth century*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1936. Pp. 176.

Major American poets. Selected and edited, with chronologies, bibliographies, and notes, by HARRY HAYDEN CLARK. New York: American Book Co., [1936]. Pp. xiv+964.

MOSSNER, ERNEST CAMPBELL. *Bishop Butler and the age of reason: a study in the history of thought*. New York: Macmillan Co., 1936. Pp. xv+271.

NAUMANN, WALTER. *Der Sprachgebrauch Mallarmés*. Marburg (Lahn): Buchdruckerei Hermann Bauer, 1936. Pp. xx+230.

NICHOLSON, G. -G. *Un nouveau principe d'etymologie romane*. Paris: Librairie E. Droz, [1936]. Pp. viii+393.

OHLANDER, URBAN. *Studies on coordinate expressions in Middle English*. ("Lund studies in English," Vol. V.) Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, [1936]. Pp. 214.

OMODEO, ADOLFO. *Alfredo Loisy: storico delle religioni*. ("Biblioteca di cultura moderna,") Bari: Laterza & Figli, 1936. Pp. 131.

PATRICK, DAVID LYALL. *The textual history of "Richard III."* ("Stanford University Publications, University series: Language and Literature," Vol. VI, No. 1.) Stanford University, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1936. Pp. 153.

The best plays of Racine. Translated into English rhyming verse with introduction and notes by LACY LOCKERT. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1936. Pp. xii+412.

REDING, KATHERINE P. *The generation of 1898 in Spain as seen through its fictional hero*. ("Smith College studies in modern languages," Vol. XVII, Nos. 3 and 4.) Northampton, Mass.: Smith College, [1936]. Pp. viii+125.

REYNOLDS, ERNEST. *Early Victorian drama*. Cambridge: W. Heffer & Sons, 1936. Pp. 163.

RHEINFELDER, HANS. *Altfranzösische Grammatik*. Erster Teil: *Laullehre*. ("Huebers kurze Grammatiken.") München: Max Hueber Verlag, 1936. Pp. xvi+323.

ROTH, JOHANNES. *Der Ritterspiegel*. Herausgegeben von HANS NEUMANN. ("Altdedeutsche Textbibliothek," No. 38.) Halle (Saale): Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1936. Pp. xxii+122.

RUSSELL, JOSIAH COX. *Dictionary of writers of thirteenth century England*. ("Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research," Spec. Suppl. No. 3.) London & New York: Longmans, Green & Co., [1936]. Pp. x+210.

SCHOSSIG, ALFRED. *Verbum, Aktionsart und Aspekt in der Histoire du Seigneur de Bayard par Le Loyal Serviteur*. ("Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie," Heft 87.) Halle (Saale): Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1936. Pp. x+251.

SCHUCHARD, HERBERT. *Beiträge zur Geschichte der italienischen Scheidewörter*. ("Berliner Beiträge zur

romanischen Philologie," Band VI, Heft 3.) Jena und Leipzig: Verlag von Wilhelm Gronaw, 1936. Pp. 125.

SEHRT, ERNST THEODOR. *Geschichtliches und religiöses Denken bei Thomas De Quincey.* ("Neue deutsche Forschungen," Abteilung englische Philologie, Band VII.) Berlin: Junker & Dunnhaupt Verlag, 1936. Pp. 57.

SEILLIÈRE, ERNEST. *David-Herbert Lawrence et les récentes idéologies allemandes.* Paris: Boivin & Cie, 1936. Pp. xviii+282.

SHAKESPEARE, WILLIAM. *Henry the fourth*, Part I. Edited by SAMUEL BURDETT HEMINGWAY. ("A new variorum edition of Shakespeare.") Philadelphia & London: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1936. Pp. xii+554.

Shakespeare-Jahrbuch, Band LXXII. Herausgegeben im Auftrage der deutschen Shakespeare-Gesellschaft von WOLFGANG KELLER. Weimar: Verlag Hermann Böhlau Nachfolger, 1936. Pp. 262.

SHAKESPEARE, WILLIAM. *King John.* Edited by JOHN DOVER WILSON. ("The New Shakespeare.") Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; New York: Macmillan Co., 1936. Pp. lxxxi+208.

Shakespeare's sonnets. Edited with introduction and notes by TUCKER

BROOKE. London and New York: Oxford University Press, 1936. Pp. 346.

SHEPPERSON, ARCHIBALD BOLLING. *The novel in motley: a history of the burlesque novel in English.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1936. Pp. viii+301.

SHOEMAKER, ERVIN C. *Noah Webster, pioneer of learning.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1936. Pp. vii+347.

SNYDER, FRANKLYN BLISS. *Robert Burns, his personality, his reputation, and his art.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1936. Pp. 119.

Two Old French poems on Saint Thibault. Edited with introduction, notes and glossary by RAYMOND THOMPSON HILL. ("Yale Romanic studies," Vol. XI.) New Haven: Yale University Press, 1936. Pp. vi+182.

VICO, GIAMBATTISTA. *Il diritto universale.* A cura di FAUSTO NICOLINI. ("Scrittori d'Italia," Nos. 160, 161, 162.) "Sinopsi," "De Uno"; "De constantia iurisprudentis"; "Natae," "Dissertationes." Bari: Laterza & Figli, 1936. 3 vols.

WRIGHT, EDITH A. *The dissemination of the liturgical drama in France.* Bryn Mawr dissertation. Bryn Mawr, Pa., 1936. Pp. vii+201.